

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
KÖRNER, JOSEF.—Marginalien zu Heine II, - - - - -	399
KOENIG, V. F.—'A or batu': a Problem in Lexicology, - - - - -	413
O'BRIEN, JUSTIN.—Henry Harland, an American Forerunner of Proust, - - - - -	420
JOLIAT, EUGÈNE.—Smollett, Editor of Voltaire, - - - - -	429
LANCASTER, H. C.—Castillo Solórzano's 'El coloso hasta la muerte' and Montfleury's 'Ecole des Jaloux,' - - - - -	436
MATHEWS, ERNST G.—Montfleury's 'Ecole des Jaloux' and Aphra Behn's 'The False Count,' - - - - -	438
WRIGHT, L. O. AND ROBE, S. L.—Final Consonant Plus 'N'-Glide in Jalisco, Mexico, - - - - -	439
COLLEDGE, ERIC.—"The Hours of the Planets": an Obscure Passage in "The Recluse," - - - - -	442
STURTEVANT, A. M.—The Doublets Old Icelandic Skyti: Skytja, 'Shooter, Marksman,' - - - - -	445
SANDERLIN, GEORGE.—Quotations from St. Bernard in "The Parson's Tale," - - - - -	447
SCOTT-THOMAS, H. F.—A Chaucerian(?) Fisherman, - - - - -	448
HAMMETT, E. A.—A Note for the 'NED.' - - - - -	449
BANKS, T. H.—The Meaning of "Gods" in 'Paradise Lost,' - - - - -	450
VINCENT, H. P.—Three Unpublished Letters of Abraham Cowley, - - - - -	454
WILSON, J. H.—Two Poems Ascribed to Rochester, - - - - -	458
WASSERMAN, E. R.—The Walpole-Chatterton Controversy, - - - - -	460
SANDERLIN, GEORGE.—The Repute of Shakespeare's Sonnets in the Early Nineteenth Century, - - - - -	462
PITT, A. S.—Franklin and William Penn's 'No Cross, No Crown,' - - - - -	466
BOYS, RICHARD.—David Malloch and 'The Edinburgh Miscellany,' - - - - -	468

## REVIEWS:—

A. H. GILBERT, Machiavelli's <i>Prince</i> and its Forerunners. [N. Orsini.] -	469
L. M. PRICE (ed.), <i>Inkle and Yarico</i> . [G. Chinard.] -	470
M. E. MARCETT, <i>Uhtred de Boldon</i> , <i>Friar William Jordan</i> , and "Piers Plowman." [C. O. Chapman.] -	472
E. A. BAKER, <i>The History of the English Novel</i> , IX. [J. W. Beach.] -	474
BRIEF MENTION: C. S. GUTKIND, <i>Cosimo de' Medici</i> ; L. N. BROUGHTON (ed.), <i>Sara Coleridge and Henry Reed</i> ; G. E. NOYES (ed.), <i>Bibliography of Courtesy and Conduct Books in Seventeenth-century England</i> , -	475

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLB.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

The General Index of volumes 1 to 50, xii + 310 pages, was published in December 1935. The price is \$5.00 net.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

*ELH*

*A Journal of English Literary History*

*ELH*, the only American journal devoted exclusively to anglistics, is now published for the Tudor and Stuart Club by The Johns Hopkins Press.

Issued quarterly beginning with March. Subscription, \$2.50 a year. Business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1102,  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

tors  
the  
ript  
cles  
the  
of  
quo-  
not  
MP,  
tors  
ness



t,  
s

c.

E





# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LIV

JUNE, 1939

Number 6

---

## MARGINALIEN ZU HEINE II

### *Ideen. Das Buch Le Grand. Kap. VII. a)*

“... manche Potentaten wurden [durch Napoleon] von Haus und Hof gejagt und mußten auf andre Art ihr Brot zu verdienen suchen, und einige legten sich daher früh auf ein Handwerk und machten z. B. Siegellack...” (Walzel iv, S. 163).

W. Siebert, *H. Heines Beziehungen zu E. T. A. Hoffmann* (Marburg 1908) S. 19, verweist auf den *Kater Murr* (Grisebachs Ausgabe x, S. 117), wo an die Zeit des politischen und sozialen Umsturzes der französischen Revolution erinnert wird, “als Marquis Siegellack fabrizierten.” Obwohl das Sinn und Witz der Heinestelle—ein Potentat legt sich aufs Handwerk, noch eh er entthront wurde; er baut klüglich vor—gar nicht trifft, haben Petersen (Walzel iv, S. 509) und Elster (<sup>2</sup>iv, S. 513) diese Erklärung angenommen. Zu Unrecht. Eine Anekdote, die in Maximilian Heines *Erinnerungen* mitgeteilt wird, auch ungefähr in die Entstehungszeit des *Buchs Le Grand* fallen muß (Houben Nr. 157), witzelt deutlicher mit “des Kaisers Siegellack,” und der Berichterstatter fügt selber die Deutung an: es sei “allgemein bekannt, dass der damalige Kaiser Franz von Oesterreich die große Passion hatte, freie Augenblicke der Anfertigung von Siegellack in allen möglichen Farben zu widmen.” Offenbar ist dieselbe Spitze verborgen in einer Bemerkung der “Einleitung zu Kahldorf” (Walzel v, S. 401 f.): “Oesterreich... besorgte die Adelsinteressen, und auf jedem feigen Verträgelein, das gegen den Liberalismus geschlossen wurde, prangt obenan das wohlbekannte Siegellack.”

### *Ideen. Das Buch Le Grand. Kap. VII. b)*

Erich Loewenthal, *Studien zu Heines “Reisebildern”* (Palaestra 138, Berlin und Leipzig 1922) S. 5 f. macht die sehr treffende, von der Forschung noch lange nicht genug verwertete Bemerkung, daß

die autobiographischen Notizen, die Heine zwanglos in seine Schriften einzuschieben liebt, durchaus nicht Mystifikation bedeuten, sondern zu allermeist der historischen Nachprüfung standhalten. Aber er widerspricht sich gleich selbst, wenn er (S. 6) die Notiz am angeführten Orte: "In diesem Augenblick fällt mir ein, daß ich dem Löwenwirt in Bologna noch fünf Taler schuldig bin" (Walzel IV, S. 165) für bloßen Scherz hält, weil das doch vor Heines Reise nach Italien geschrieben sei. Schon Elster (<sup>2</sup>IV, S. 513) hat richtig gesehen, daß Bologna hier nur romantisierender Deckname für Göttingen sei (wird doch auch sonst in dem Stück ein nördlicheres Geschehen an die Brenta und den Ganges transponiert), aber seine Begründung ist ungeschickt. Nicht auf Nr. 80 der *Heimkehr* war zu verweisen, wo in ähnlicher Weise aus der hannöverschen Universitätsstadt ein spanisches Salamanka wird, sondern auf die *Bäder von Lucca*, Kap. v, Schluß: "Göttingen ist in Bologna lange nicht so bekannt, wie man schon, der Dankbarkeit wegen, erwarten dürfte, indem es sich das deutsche Bologna zu nennen pflegt." Und auch sachlich dürfte keineswegs bloßer Phantasiescherz vorliegen, vielmehr heitere Anspielung auf die sehr reale Tatsache, daß Heine (nach Varnhagens Zeugnis; vgl. Houben S. 100) noch von seinem Doktorschmaus her "einen Anker Wein" schuldig war.

*Italien. Reise von München nach Genua. Kap. VIII u. XIX.*

Gegen Kaiser Franz wird in den *Reisebildern* häufiger gestichelt, als die Kommentatoren bisher bemerkt haben. Der Witz mit den Engländern in der Innsbrucker Hofkirche, die den Reiseführer verkehrt gebrauchen und dessen Angaben mit den Statuen um Maximilians Grab zu falscher und sehr komischer Deckung zwingen, ist keineswegs als billiger Spaß um seiner selbst willen angebracht, sondern um die boshafte Pointe: sollte es "dem jetzigen Kaiser einfallen, sich in einem Reifrock oder gar in Windeln gießen zu lassen—wer würde was dagegen einwenden" (Walzel IV, S. 243)—in so harmlose Umgebung einzuschmuggeln, daß der Zensor nichts merkt.

Wenn dergestalt Kaiser Franz schon hier altes Weib und Wickelkind gescholten ist, so wird man auch einen "Romulus Augustulus II," unter dem "das heilige römische Reich . . . zu Grunde ging," und zwar in "neuester Zeit" (Walzel IV, S. 269), nicht mit Elster

(<sup>2</sup>IV, S. 189) auf den, deutschen Lesern so unbekannten wie gleichgültigen und obendrein schon verstorbenen, sizilischen Ferdinand (†1825) beziehen, sondern auf den Habsburger, der unter dem Namen Franz der *Zweite* als letzter die alte Kaiserkrone getragen hat.

*Reisebilder III. Reise von München nach Genua*

Den Panegyricus des 33. Kapitels auf Peter Cornelius beschließt Heine mit der pietätvollen Erinnerung daran, daß die Hand des großen Malers "einst liebevoll auf den kleinen Fingern lag und mir einige Gesichtskonturen ziehen half, als ich, ein kleines Büchchen, auf der Akademie zu Düsseldorf zeichnen lernte."—Petersens Kommentar (Walzel IV, S. 524) glaubt hier einen Gedächtnisfehler des Autors, Verwechslung mit dem älteren Bruder Lambert Cornelius (1778-1823), seinerzeitigem Inspektor der Düsseldorfer Akademie, feststellen zu müssen. Mit Unrecht. In einem Gespräch über Heine vom 19. März 1865 gibt Peter selbst eine ergötzliche Erklärung: "Ich habe ihn auch einmal durchgeprügelt . . . Der Lambert ging immer um 11 Uhr aus der Akademie, um eine Stunde außer dem Hause zu geben, und da mußte ich Präceptor spielen. Neben der Elementarklasse war das Zimmer, wo ich stand und malte; es war, ich weiß es noch genau, ein Altarbild. Die Jungen aber, statt zu zeichnen, machten furchtbaren Lärm. Ich ging also hinein und verbot es ihnen, und so ging es eine Weile. Bald aber fingen sie noch viel ärger an. Ich stürzte also in die Klasse. In der linken Hand hielt ich die Palette wie Achilles seinen Schild, in der rechten hatte ich den Malstock, und packte mir nun den ersten, der mir in die Hände kam. Das war der Heine. Ich habe den Malstock auf ihm zerschlagen und ihn schwer geprügelt."

(Herman Riegel, *Peter Cornelius*, Berlin 1883, S. 76.—In diesem Buche, das der Heine-Forschung entgangen zu sein scheint, denn weder Bieber noch Houben führen es an, findet sich auch eine interessante Mitteilung über Heines Eltern [S. 12 f.] und die Wiedergabe eines bedeutsamen Gesprächs [S. 68]: Peter Cornelius erzählt, "daß er Heine einmal in München [1827/8] auf dem Dultplatze eines Sonntags Vormittags begegnet und ordentlich und gerade heraus mit ihm gesprochen habe; Heine habe alles ruhig mit angehört und endlich halb wehmütig gesagt: 'Ich bin doch am Ende nicht so schlimm als Sie meinen.'")

*Italien. Die Bäder von Lucca. Kap. I.*

Sein Zwiegespräch mit der Engländerin Mathilde beendet der Erzähler also: "Es ist gut, daß wir uns wiedergefunden, und der große deutsche—wird sich wieder ein Vergnügen daraus machen, sein Leben bei Ihnen zu wagen" (Walzel iv, S. 323). Die Kommentare schweigen zu dieser Stelle. Aber ich glaube nicht, daß sie jeder Leser auch ohne Belehrung versteht. Der Gedankenstrich ersetzt offenbar ein fehlendes Wort. Welches?—Derjenige, der sich ein Vergnügen daraus machen wird, bei, mit Mathilde zu leben, kann natürlich nur Heine sein. Er hatte sich schon im ersten Teil der *Reisebilder* (1826), in Nr. XIII der *Heimkehr-Gedichte*, frank und frech als einen der besten und bekanntesten deutschen Dichter selbstgelobt (Walzel i, S. 114), im zweiten Teil (*Das Buch Le Grand*, Walzel iv, S. 185) wenigstens scherzhafter Weise unter den "grossen Männern" der Weltgeschichte sich mitangeführt; genau so mochte er sich jetzt wieder als "der große deutsche Dichter" bezeichnen. Aber das für Heine so charakteristische Zwielficht von Ernst und Spaß, von Pathos und Ironie, in das er den Ausspruch getaucht haben wollte, war quälender und also wirksamer, wenn das absichtlich schockierende Wort unausgesprochen und doch erratbar blieb.

*Italien. Die Bäder von Lucca. Kap. VIII.*

Der Schluß dieses Kapitels ist wohl die schwerstverständliche Stelle der ganzen *Reisebilder* und bislang völlig ungeklärt. Petersen (bei Walzel iv, S. 527) schweigt sich gänzlich darüber aus, Elster (<sup>2</sup>iv, S. 537 f.) stellt bedauernd fest, er habe über den berühmten Kinderball im Hause Rothschild "leider nichts Genaueres zu ermitteln" gewußt. Sollte er naiverweise an die Wirklichkeit eines solchen Balls geglaubt haben? Die Geschichte gibt sich doch unverkennbar als phantastische Groteske. Hyacinth Hirsch, seiner guten Beziehungen zur höchsten Plutokraten-Dynastie sich rühmend, erzählt, er habe in Frankfurt auch den (seit 1820 in Wien <sup>1</sup> residierenden!) Baron Salomon Rothschild kennen gelernt und allerlei Freundliches von ihm erfahren: "er behandelte mich ganz wie seines Gleichen, ganz famillionär. Ich war auch bei ihm auf

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. Egon Caesar Conte Corti, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Rothschild* (Leipzig 1927), S. 245.

dem berühmten Kinderball, der in der Zeitung gestanden. So viel Pracht bekomme ich mein Lebtag nicht mehr zu sehen . . . wie viel Gold und Silber und Diamanten habe ich dort gesehen! Wie viel Sterne und Orden! Den Falkenorden, das goldene Vlies, den Löwenorden, den Adlerorden—sogar ein ganz klein Kind, ich sage Ihnen ein ganz klein Kind trug einen Elefantenorden. Die Kinder waren gar schön maskiert und spielten Anleihe, und waren angezogen wie die Könige, mit Kronen auf den Köpfen, ein großer Junge aber war angezogen präzise wie der alte Nathan Rothschild. Er machte seine Sache sehr gut, hatte beide Hände in der Hosentasche, klimperte mit Geld, schüttelte sich verdrießlich, wenn einer von den kleinen Königen was geborgt haben wollte, und nur dem kleinen mit dem weißen Rock und den roten Hosen streichelte er freundlich die Backen und lobte ihn: 'Du bist mein Plaisir, mein Liebling, mein' Pracht, aber dein Vetter Michel soll mir vom Leib bleiben, ich werde diesem Narrn nichts borgen, der täglich mehr Menschen ausgibt, als er jährlich zu verzehren hat; es kommt durch ihn noch ein Unglück in die Welt, und mein Geschäft wird darunter leiden.' So wahr mir Gott alles Gute gebe, der Junge machte seine Sache sehr gut, besonders wenn er das dicke Kind, das in weißen Atlas mit echten silbernen Lilien gewickelt war, im Gehen unterstützte und bisweilen zu ihm sagte: 'Na, na, du, du, führ dich nur gut auf, ernähr dich redlich, sorg, daß du nicht wieder weggejagt wirst, damit ich nicht mein Geld verliere'" (Walzel IV, S. 358 f.).

Elsters wenige Anmerkungen zu diesem Abschnitte führen nicht weit, gehen zum Teil auch fehl. Richtig ist, daß "der Kleine mit dem weißen Rock und den roten Hosen" auf den so fleißig gehänselten Kaiser Franz zielt, was nicht zuletzt die analoge Bezeichnung des österreichischen Herrschers als des "Kaisers, der einen weißen Rock und rote Hosen trägt," im 12. Kap. der *Reise von München nach Genua* (Walzel IV, S. 251) erweist.<sup>2</sup> Zu dieser Deutung also brauchte Elster (2IV, S. 538) kein Fragezeichen zu setzen. Daß die Verbindung der Rothschilds mit dem Hause Oesterreich besonders eng war, bezeugt Cortis Darstellung, besonders in den zwei letzten Kapiteln, fast auf jeder Seite. Hingegen möchte ich bestreiten, daß die aufgezählten Orden tatsächlich jene Länder bezeichnen sollen, in

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. auch Walzel IX, S. 11, Z. 14, wo Metternich genannt wird "der Ex-Wesir so vieler präadamitischen Sultane, die alle weiße Röcke und rote Hosen getragen."



denen sie ihre heraldische Heimat haben (Elster a. a. O.); Heine treibt vielmehr ein loses Spiel mit den unterschiedlichen Tiernamen (es ist doch auffallend, daß er nur "tierische" Orden nennt), die er bis zum Elefanten steigert. An Siam hat er dabei gewiß nicht gedacht, umsoweniger als (was Elster übersah), der siamesische Elefantenorden erst 1861 gestiftet worden ist; vorgeschwebt haben kann ihm nur der ebenso bezeichnete älteste und höchste dänische Orden (Vgl. Berlien, *Der Elefantenorden und seine Ritter*, Kopenhagen 1846). "Das dicke Kind, das in weißen Atlas mit echten silbernen Lilien gewickelt war," ist selbstverständlich auf Frankreich zu beziehen; ob mit Elster noch genauer auf den (bereits am 16. Sept. 1824 verschiedenen) wohlbeleibten Ludwig XVIII. (denn Karl X. war sehr mager), bleibt fraglich; man kann das immerhin mit dem Hinweis stützen, daß es Ludwig XVIII. nur vermöge der Rothschildschen Geldhilfe möglich war, wenige Tage nach Napoleons Abdankung schon in Calais zu landen und seinen Einzug in Paris zu halten. Trifft Elsters Deutung zu, so erleichtert sie aus chronologischen Gründen die Lösung des Gesamträtsels.

Prüft man die Groteske genauer, so ergibt sich eine schier unbegreifliche Lücke in der Erzählung. Nirgends wird verraten, wo denn eigentlich der "Kinderball" stattgefunden hat. Bei Salomon Rothschild, heißt es zwar ausdrücklich, aber unklar bleibt, in welcher Stadt. In Frankfurt etwa? Dann müßte es vor 1820 geschehen sein, ehe Salomon nach Wien zog; aber der eigentliche Glanz und Einfluß der Rothschilds ereignete sich erst jenseits dieses Datums. Also in Wien? Aber von einem Wiener Aufenthalt spricht Hyacinth Hirsch nicht. Offenbar ist die Übertragung des eigentlich Gemeinten auf die Ballgeschichte etwas oberflächlich geraten, und gerade dieser Umstand bestärkt den "Verdacht" des Schlüssel-Charakters.

Es ist die Rede von einem großen, einem strahlenden Fest, wo Kinder, als Könige maskiert, Anleihe spielen; Salomon gibt das Fest, aber der "große Junge," der den Weltbankier herstellt, trägt nicht seine, sondern Nathans Maske.

Daran entspricht zunächst soviel der Wirklichkeit, daß der in London etablierte Nathan, obwohl nur der drittälteste der fünf Frankfurter Brüder, als eigentlicher Kopf und Leiter des ganzen Hauses galt und wirkte (Corti a. a. O. S. 160, 331, 346, 368). Aber der Veranstalter des Balls ist und bleibt Salomon.

Ein Ball? Kinder als Könige maskiert; ein rauschendes Fest, unabsehbar von Gold und Diamanten, Sternen und Orden strahlend. Könnte es nicht so gemeint sein, daß eine Versammlung von Fürsten und Königen, bei der es prunkhaft zugeht und alle Würdenträger in großer Gala aufziehen, dem kritischen Betrachter als bloße Kinderei erscheint; zumal dann, wenn Versammlung und Beratung jedes tieferen Ernstes, allen wertvollen Ergebnisses ermangeln?

Wir sähen uns dann verwiesen auf einen leerlaufenden Diplomaten- und Fürstenkongress. In erster Linie wäre an den von Verona (20. Oktober 1822) zu denken, dessen Pracht H. von Treitschke (*Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* III, Leipzig 1885, S. 271) und A. Stern (*Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815* II, Berlin 1897, S. 292) gleich eindrucksvoll schildern: "Seit dem Wiener Kongress war dem Weltteil ein ähnliches Schauspiel nicht geboten worden." Anwesend waren Kaiser Franz mit mehreren Erzherzögen, der Zar Alexander, der König von Preußen mit den Prinzen Wilhelm und Karl, die Könige von Sardinien und Neapel, der Kronprinz von Schweden, eine ganze Schar italienischer Kleinfürsten und Prinzen, sie alle begleitet von ausgiebigem Beamten-Stab.<sup>3</sup> In der österreichischen Delegation befand sich neben Metternich und Gentz auch Salomon Rothschild. Ihm blühte hier gar üppig der Weizen. Mit den Vertretern des Zarenreichs schloß er eine fette Anleihe ab, wofür ihm noch der Wladimirorden verliehen ward, was die beiden größten deutschen Zeitungen, die *Augsburger Allgemeine* und der *Oesterreichische Beobachter*, gebührend in die Öffentlichkeit brachten, und er fand auch sonst hier Gelegenheit zu glänzenden Geschäften. So glänzende und weitreichende Geschäfte eröffneten sich, daß rasch noch zwei andere Rothschilds, James aus Paris und Carl aus Neapel, nach Verona eilten.<sup>4</sup> Da konnte im Hohlspiegel des Spottes das Antlitz des Kongresses leicht dahin verzerrt werden, als sei das Ganze eine Veranstaltung der Rothschilds gewesen; ein Kinderball.

Ich will nicht behaupten, dies sei die einzig mögliche Deutung der Groteske. Vielmehr werfe ich selber als entscheidend die Frage auf, ob Heines Leser im Jahr 1830 solche Anspielungen auf ein Ereignis von 1822 noch verstehen konnten. Aber keinen Zweifel zu

<sup>3</sup> Ludwig XVIII war durch sein Gichtleiden an der Teilnahme verhindert, aber immerhin durch fünf Gesandte vertreten.

<sup>4</sup> Vgl. Corti, a. a. O. S. 299-304.

leiden scheint mir, daß auch im Verneinungsfalle die endgültige Auflösung des Rätsels nur in der Richtung meines, sei's auch vorläufig problematischen, Vorstoßes zu finden sei.

Mit der gleichen Zurückhaltung versuche ich mich noch an zwei Einzelheiten. Wer ist "Vetter Michel"? Elster a. a. O. enthält sich jeder Meinungsäußerung. Wenn eine Deutung aus der Zeitgeschichte zulässig ist, so kann man an zweierlei denken. Entweder ist der Name mit Anlehnung an den "deutschen Michel" gebildet und meint den eigentlichen deutschen Großstaat, also Preußen, das vermöge streng durchgeführter allgemeiner Wehrpflicht eine militärische Kraft besaß, die in gar keinem Verhältnis stand zu dem vergleichsweise geringen Umfang und der noch geringeren Finanzkraft dieses Staatswesens, und die auf liberaler Seite nicht gern gesehen, umso lieber als Bedrohung des Weltfriedens verdächtigt wurde;<sup>5</sup> oder man darf den Namen wörtlich nehmen, dann muss es der portugiesische Reaktionsführer und Kronprätendent Dom Miguel sein, der nach dem Mißlingen seines Putsches vom 30. April 1824 nach Wien in die Verbannung ging und vom österreichischen Hofe, bezhw. durch Metternich seither vielfach protegiert wurde. Trifft diese Erklärung das Rechte, so dürfte auch das "ganz klein Kind" mit dem Elefantenorden seine historische Gleichung finden.<sup>6</sup>

Als König Johann VI. von Portugal am 10. März 1826 starb, verzichtete sein ältester Sohn, Dom Pedro, der sich schon am 12. Oktober 1822 zum Kaiser von Brasilien und vom Vater unabhängig erklärt hatte, aus Inkompatibilitätsgründen auf den Thron des Mutterlands, und zwar zu Gunsten seiner erst siebenjährigen (am 4. April 1819 geborenen) Tochter Maria da Gloria, die mit Dom Miguel verlobt und, nach Erreichung des nötigen Alters, vermählt werden sollte. Dadurch wäre, da das königliche Kind eine Enkelin von Kaiser Franz war (Dom Pedro war 1817-1826 mit dessen

<sup>5</sup> Im Winter 1829/30, also gerade als Heine mit der Niederschrift der *Bäder von Lucca* beschäftigt war, unterhandelte Preussen mit dem Hause Rothschild tatsächlich über eine grössere Anleihe, die schließlich auch zustande kam (vgl. Corti S. 404 f.).

<sup>6</sup> Wofern solche Erklärung nicht von vornherein zu weit hergeholt ist und die Ironie der Stelle weit einfacher darauf weist, daß einer der kleinsten europäischen Staaten (daher die Bezeichnung "ganz klein Kind"; auf dem Balle sind ja die Monarchien alle durch Kinder repräsentiert) den Orden mit dem mächtigsten Tiere schmückt und benennt.

Tochter Leopoldine vermählt), in der Tat eine Art Vetternschaft Dom Miguels mit dem Hause Habsburg gestiftet worden. Die Umtriebe des intransigenten Prinzen beunruhigten bisweilen ganz Europa, das dadurch besonders i. J. 1826 an den Rand eines allgemeinen Kriegs gebracht war, dessen Gefahr eine berühmte energische Parlamentsrede Cannings vom 12. Dez. 1826 zugleich beschwor und bannte. Diese Rede, die in aller Öffentlichkeit mit dem Gedanken der Entfesselung der revolutionären Kräfte des alten Kontinents spielte, sich an die liberalen Geister aller Völker wandte, hatte auf Heine, der ja in Canning (unberechtigterweise) einen Märtyrer des Liberalismus verehrte (vgl. Walzel IV, S. 301 f.; VI, S. 148), zweifellos nachhaltigen Eindruck geübt. Daß sich Heine mit der Person Dom Miguels beschäftigt hat, bezeugen andre seiner Schriften, vor allem die am 8. März 1831 aufgesetzte *Einleitung zu Kahldorf über den Adel*, wo jener ein "gekrönter Wicht" gescholten wird, "der dem Stande [der Könige] Unehre macht" (Walzel VI, S. 405, 513).<sup>7</sup> Es wäre also sehr wohl möglich, daß der Dichter schon 1829 seiner Abneigung Ausdruck verliehen hat.

Daß die Rothschilds jeden Krieg—von welcher Art Michel er auch angezettelt werden mochte—als geschäftestörend perhorreszierten, belegt (wenn es solchen Beweises überhaupt bedürfte) Cortis Buch an vielen Stellen (z. B. S. 307).

#### *Italien. Die Bäder von Lucca. Kap. XI.*

Fritz Friedländer, *Heine und Goethe* (Berlin und Leipzig 1932) S. 39, hat—so weit ich sehe, als Erster—erkannt, daß der "ernste Adler," von dem der vorletzte Absatz in Kap. III der *Stadt Lucca* so viel zu sagen weiß, eine Allegorie auf Goethe bedeutet. Aber auch ihm ist entgangen, daß in gleicher Verhüllung schon die Platen-Diatribe eine kleine Huldigung für Goethe anbringt. Platen wird dort (Walzel IV, S. 400) mit dem Vogel Strauß verglichen, dem "eiteln, ohnmächtigen Vogel, der das schönste Gefieder hat und doch nicht fliegen kann," und es heißt zuletzt von ihm, er bilde "mit seinen schönen Federn ohne Schwungkraft, mit seinen schönen Versen ohne poetischen Flug, den Gegensatz zu jenem Adler des Gesanges, der minder glänzende Flügel hat, aber sich damit zur Sonne erhebt." Damit kann nur Goethe gemeint sein.

<sup>7</sup> Im Herbst 1830 schon befandete der Hamburger Freundeskreis des Dichters heftig "dieses portugiesische Ungeheuer" (Houben S. 173).

*Italien. Die Stadt Lucca Kap. VI.*

Dieses Kapitel leiten ein die Verse 597-604 von Vossens Verdeutschung der *Ilias*; aber statt der Namen des Dichters oder des Übersetzers schreibt Heine unter die Verse kühn und einfach "*Vulgata*." Die Kommentare lassen Sinn und Absicht dieser Sonderbarkeit unberedet. Es scheint also bisher nicht verstanden zu sein, was die Unterschrift, was das Zitat selber ausdrücken soll.

Auf die Verse folgt unmittelbar jenes großartige, Dichtung wie Bildkunst noch nachgeborener Generationen weithin bestimmende Gemälde vom Christus im Olymp, das erstmals Heines weltanschauliche Leitidee eines ewigen Gegensatzes von Sensualismus und Spiritualismus, von Hellenentum und Nazarenertum ausspricht. Das Kapitel klingt aus in ein hymnisches Bekenntnis zum Leib, zum Sensualismus, zum Hellenismus. Die Bibel des Hellenismus aber ist Homer, und wie für die römisch-katholische Kirche die Bibelübersetzung des Hieronymus, so ist für den deutschen "Hellenen" Vossens deutscher Homer maßgebend—die "*Vulgata*."

Eine ähnliche Zusammenstellung Homers und der Bibel als der zwei "großen Bücher" findet sich in der *Denkschrift über Ludwig Börne* (Walzel VIII, S. 396); und in diesem Buche spricht Heine noch an anderer Stelle von der "*Ecclesia pressa*, die den Homeros als ihren Propheten verehrt" (S. 400). Beide Stellen aus dem eingelegten Helgoländer Tagebuch von 1830, also auch zeitlich (entstehungsgeschichtlich) der *Stadt Lucca* nahestehend.

Auch in den *Erläuterungen zum Doktor Faust* (x, S. 70 f.) wird der gleiche Gedanke angeführt, dort, wo vom Geist der Renaissance die Rede ist: "Die beiden großen Bücher der Menschheit, die sich vor einem Jahrtausend so feindlich befehdet und wie kampfmüde während dem ganzen Mittelalter vom Schauplatz zurückgezogen hatten, der Homer und die Bibel, treten zu Anfang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts wieder öffentlich in die Schranken."

Und zum letztenmal begegnet die Antithese, diesmal mit der durch Heines "Konversion" zum Theismus bewirkten Umkehrung der Vorzeichen, wieder in den *Geständnissen* (Walzel x, S. 184): "ich, der ich ehemals den Homer zu zitieren pflegte, ich zitiere jetzt die Bibel."

*Italien. Die Stadt Lucca. Kap. VII.*

Die Kathedrale, in der Heine mit Franscheska und Mathilde einer großen Messe beiwohnt, ist nach Karpeles und Elster (<sup>2</sup>rv, S. 551)



der Dom San Martino. Da nur für diese Szene Heines Widmungsverse *An August Lewald* (Walzel III, S. 454; vgl. S. 538) passen, ist Elsters Anmerkung a. a. O. S. 550, die das Gedichtlein auf Kap. VI und die Kirche San Michele bezieht, als offenkundiges Versehen zu streichen.

*Die romantische Schule. Drittes Buch.*

In der feinsinnigen, immer noch unveralteten Würdigung, die Heine dem bis heut verkannten Achim von Arnim gönnt (Walzel VII, S. 126), werden Tieck und die Schlegels verantwortlich gemacht für die Verdunkelung dieses großen deutschen Dichters; sie hätten ihn absichtlich ignoriert. "Nur nach seinem Tode," so schließt der erste Absatz des Arnim-Kapitels, "erhielt er eine Art Nekrolog von einem Mitglied der Schule."—Eine Anmerkung von Elsters erster Ausgabe (V, S. 317) verweist hier auf eine Arbeit des Wilibald Alexis im Berliner *Freimütigen* (1831, Nr. 25); das wird von Walzel kritiklos übernommen. Aber Häring-Alexis war niemals "Mitglied der Schule," kann demnach hier unmöglich gemeint sein. Wohl aber trifft solche Bezeichnung voll auf Görres zu, der dem verewigten Freunde im Cottaschen *Literaturblatt* (Beilage zum Stuttgarter *Morgenblatt*) 1831, Nr. 27-30, einen herrlichen, Aufsehen erregenden Nachruf gehalten hat.

*Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland.  
Zweites Buch.*

Hier ist gelegentlich die Rede von Hermann Franckes Stiftung des Halleschen Waisenhauses und dem dadurch bewirkten pietistischen Geiste dieser Universitätsstadt (Walzel VII, S. 273). "Halle," heißt es dann, "ist noch bis jetzt die Taupinière der Pietisten."—Elster (IV, S. 230) weiß mit dem seltsamen Fremdwort nicht viel anzufangen, er übersetzt es wörtlich als "Maulwurfshügel," weist auf die Bedeutungserweiterung "schlechte Hütte" hin. Walzel, der merkt, daß das keinen rechten Sinn ergibt, möchte lieber an Verwechslung mit "Pepinière" (= Baumschule, Pflanzstätte, Seminar) denken; aber kann man im Ernst dem hochgebildeten und immer sorgfältigen Schriftsteller Heine solchen Lapsus zumuten? Viel näher liegt eine Deutung aus der Idiomatik des Parisischen. C. Villate (*Parisismen*, Berlin-Schöneberg, 1912, S. 367) wie R. Plate (*Wortkunde des modernen Französisch*, München

1933, S. 122) kennen ein Masculinum "taupin" zur Bezeichnung der Kandidaten für die (schwierige) *école polytechnique*, Villate auch ein umgangssprachliches Femininum "taupinière" für den "Kursus der höheren Mathematik als Vorbereitung zur Aufnahme in die polytechnische Schule." Danach treffen wir Sprach- und Spottsinn der Stelle wohl am besten mit solcher deutenden Übersetzung: "Halle ist noch jetzt die *Presse* [nach H. Pauls *Deutschem Wörterbuch* verächtliche Bezeichnung für eine Anstalt zu schneller Vorbereitung auf eine Prüfung] der Pietisten."

*Lutezia. Erster Teil.*

Im Nachtrag zum v. Stück (Walzel ix, S. 44) stäupt Heine den obskuren Musiker Josef Dessauer, der sich der fraglichen Gunst George Sands gerühmt hatte. Er nennt ihn "einen der miserabelsten Liederkompositors vom mundfaulsten Dialekte."—Die Kommentatoren äußern sich über den Sinn des ungewöhnlichen Beiworts nicht; gerade darum ist zu vermuten, daß sie, wie die Mehrzahl der Leser, die Absicht des Autors nicht recht erfaßt haben. Zu solchem Ende muß man nämlich die deutlichere Parallelstelle des LVI. Stücks (Walzel ix, S. 286) heranziehen, wo von "seiner [Dessauers] kauderwälschen Mundart und einer gewissen näselnden Aussprache des Deutschen, die an faule Eier erinnert," die Rede ist. Ähnlich wird die Kölner "klassisch schlechte Aussprache der Deutschen" gescholten: "eine Mundart, die wie faule Eier klingt, fast riecht" (Walzel x, S. 334). Das unappetitliche Bild begegnet schon in einer handschriftlichen Variante der *Reise von München nach Genua*; statt der schließlichen Fügung: "ein übelriechendes Lächeln spielte um den Mund" (Walzel iv, S. 230) wies das boshafte Maßmann-Porträt zuerst diese Verbreiterung auf: "... Mund, der, wenn er sich öffnete, und, mit einem Organ wie faule Eier, zu sprechen begann ..." (a. a. O. S. 469). Danach wäre jenes "mundfaul" also nicht von faul = träge abzuleiten, sondern von Mundfäule, hat den Sinn von "stinkig."<sup>8</sup> Das paßt sehr gut zu Heines

<sup>8</sup> Dieses böse Attribut spendet Heine auch sonst gerne der Mauschelrede. Etwa zum Schlusse von Stück LVII der *Lutezia*, bei Schilderung der Gesellschaft um August Leo, einen in Paris lebenden getauften Juden: "Es waren die holden Klänge der Muttersprache, sogar der Großmuttersprache, welche hier den Deutschen begrüßten. Hier ward die Mundart des Hamburger Dreckwalls am reinsten gesprochen, und wer diese klassischen Laute

allgemeiner Vorliebe und gehäufte Verwendung olfaktorischer Impressionen, Metaphern.

*Lutezia. Zweiter Teil.*

Im Abschnitt LV bewährt Heine seine treffliche Goethe-Kenntnis mit dem schließenden Vierzeiler (Walzel IX, S. 278), der den Alters-Wort- und Reimstil des Dichters glänzend parodiert; leider ist noch nicht herausgefunden, welche bestimmten Verse Goethes dabei vor-schwebten. Gänzlich übersehen aber wurde bisher, daß im Kapitel LVII eine berühmte Prosastelle des von Heine allzeit höchst-geschätzten Meisters als verstecktes Zitat verwertet wird. "Die Eisenbahnen," heißt es dort (a. a. O. S. 292), "sind ein providen-tielles Ereignis, das der Menschheit einen neuen Aufschwung gibt, das die Farbe und Gestalt des Lebens verändert; es beginnt ein neuer Abschnitt in der Weltgeschichte, und unsre Generation darf sich rühmen, daß sie dabei gewesen." "Selbstredend hat Heine kein Plagiat beabsichtigt, sondern durfte bei seinen gebildeten Lesern mit der fürs Verständnis der Anspielung nötigen Kenntnis des geflügelten Worts aus der "Kampagne in Frankreich" (anlässlich der Kanonade von Valmy) rechnen: "Von hier und heute geht eine neue Epoche der Weltgeschichte aus und ihr könnt sagen, ihr seid dabei gewesen" (Jubiläums-Ausgabe XXVIII, S. 60).

Ähnliches liegt an einer Stelle der *Geständnisse* vor (Walzel X, S. 203), wo der Dichter mit dem Tagtraum scherzt, was wohl alles aus ihm hätte werden können, wenn seine Mutter, freundschaft-lichem Rate folgend, ihn der katholischen Priesterlaufbahn zuge-führt hätte: er wäre ein galanter römischer Abbate geworden, "hätte ganz das Zeug dazu gehabt, . . . im süßesten dolce far niente dahin zu schlendern durch die Bibliotheken, Galerien, Kirchen und Ruinen der ewigen Stadt, studierend im Genusse und genießend im *Studium*. . . ." — Ohne Frage schwebt hier die v. der *Römischen Elegien* vor, insbesondere die allbekannten Verse:

Und belehr ich mich nicht, indem ich des lieblichen Busens  
Formen spähe, die Hand leite die Hüften hinab?  
Dann versteh ich den Marmor erst recht: ich denk und vergleiche  
Sehe mit fühlendem Aug, fühle mit sehender Hand.

vernahm, dem ward zumute, als röche er wieder die Twieten des Mönke-damms" (IX, S. 302).

Heines Schriften sind voll von solchen stillschweigenden Zitierungen, deren die Kommentare nur in seltenen Fällen gedenken; so spielt z. B. in der "Retrospektiven Aufklärung" des zweiten Teils der *Lutezia* bei Schilderung von Godoy's "umfangreicher kurfürstlicher Purpurnase" (Walzel IX, S. 318) das zweite Beiwort auf Eichendorffs *Aus dem Leben eines Taugenichts* an, wo bekanntlich ein stattlicher Portier mit "einer außerordentlich langen, gebogenen, kurfürstlichen Nase" (A. v. Grolman's Ausgabe II, S. 365, Z. 6 v. u.) auftritt (Die Taugenichtsnovelle hatte Heine gleich nach Erscheinen gelesen; vgl. H. Bieber, *Heines Gespräche*, Berlin, 1926, S. 77).

#### *Gedanken und Einfälle.*

Hier heißt es an einer Stelle vom Bürgerkönig Louis Philippe (Walzel X, S. 278): "Unter ihm herrschte Glück und Freiheit—er war der Roi d'Yvetot der Freiheit."—Dazu merkt Elster an (VII, S. 438): "Yvetot, kleine französische Stadt; König von Yvetot = kleiner Herr, der seinem Vergnügen lebt, Duodezfürst." Mit dieser, offenbar dem *Larousse* entnommenen Note (die Leitzmann a. a. O. S. 427 unbesehen übernimmt) ist das Verständnis der dunklen Anspielung gewiß nicht erreicht. Heines Zeitgenossen, mindestens die mit französischer Literatur vertrauten, werden ihn aber ohneweiters verstanden haben, denn sein Gleichnis ist einem der bekanntesten Gedichte Bérangers entnommen, *Le Roi d'Yvetot* betitelt und vom Mai 1813 datiert, das in der Gesamtausgabe die Reihe der Chansons eröffnet. Es weist und preist einen idyllischen Lustspielmonarchen, der lebt und leben läßt, seine Macht und Würde in keiner Weise mißbraucht, aber gerade ob so unrühmlichen Herrschens sich allgemeiner Liebe erfreut. Der bezeichnende Refrain lautet:

Quel bon petit roi c'était là!

Ein solcher *bon petit roi* der Freiheit, meint Heine, war Louis Philippe.

JOSEF KÖRNER

*Prag.*

---

## A OR BATU: A PROBLEM IN LEXICOLOGY

*A or batu* is a frequently recurring expression in Old French; it has its counterpart, *ab aur batut*, in Provençal and gave rise in Middle English to the terms *gold y-bete*<sup>1</sup> and *gold y-batrid*.<sup>2</sup> Neither the meaning of *a or batu* nor its origin, however, has yet been satisfactorily explained.

Godefroy gives in the supplement to his *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française* under the word *batre*:

*Or batu*, or martelé et réduit en fil; par altérat., la loc. *a or batu*, qui signifiait: (orné) avec de l'or battu, est devenue une expression adjectivale qui a pris l'accord du substantif auquel elle se rapportait et s'est même transformée en *batu* à (ou en) *or*.

At first sight this explanation seems adequate, and it has been accepted by a number of scholars. Careful analysis, however, will show that it must be rejected.

The circumstances noted by Godefroy concerning the agreement of *batu*, not with *or* but with the substantive modified by the entire phrase, is a constant one, there being very few cases of a contrary observance. To illustrate, let me cite three passages from *Le Conte de Poitiers*:<sup>3</sup>

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 932  | ... un cercle a or batu.                                   |
| 954  | ... dras de soie a or batus.                               |
| 1440 | Adont osterent les çaintures,<br>Qui estoient a or batues. |

Now if, as Godefroy's interpretation supposes, *batu* were originally the attribute of *or*, this mode of agreement could be accounted for only on the assumption that the elements of *a or batu* had fused and lost their identity so that the group was felt as a single word. The nature of the components of *a or batu* makes unlikely any such fusion in the first place, but let us grant its possibility: the group could not then have undergone the shift in the order of its elements

<sup>1</sup> See O. F. Emerson, "Some Notes on Chaucer and Some Conjectures," *Philological Quarterly*, II (1923), 85-90 (reprinted in the Emerson memorial volume, *Chaucer Essays and Studies* [Western Reserve University Press, 1929], pp. 384-92).

<sup>2</sup> *Sir Ferumbras* (ed. S. J. Hertridge, London, 1879), vs. 896.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. V. F. Koenig, Paris, 1937.



which Godefroy supposes in attempting to account for the alternative form *batu a or*.

As a matter of fact, *batu a or* is not a later development, but the primitive and natural order of the phrase. It is the earliest form in which the expression is found in French: <sup>4</sup>

433

Tot la guige en fu batue a or . . .

*Changun de Willame.*<sup>5</sup>

Examination of some 200 passages shows beyond doubt that *a or batu* is a poetic word order brought about to produce a rime or assonance in *u*; in prose or in the interior of a verse the order *batu a or* generally prevails.<sup>6</sup> Transposition of a past participle in this wise is not at all infrequent in Old French verse; in fact, one may cite a number of closely analogous expressions which show clearly the function of *batu* in our group. Thus: *a or gemet* (*Roland*, 1995), *a or brosdé* (*R. de Troie*, II, 1143), *a or goté* (*ibid.*, 1231), *a or tissu* (*Perceval*, 9178), *a or bendé* (*Joufroi*, 408), *et al.* In none of these is there the slightest question of the past participle's ever having stood in direct junction with *or*.

In the phrase *a or batu*, then, *batu* does not and did not originally indicate the state of the gold, but rather the manner in which it was fixed upon the object in question. The fact that *or batu*, when these two words formed a junction, might mean gold leaf or gold thread has no particular bearing on our case, and there is in *a or*

<sup>4</sup> In Provençal, however, there is a somewhat earlier example of the other order in the *Chanson de sainte Foi d'Agen* (ed. A. Thomas, Paris, 1925):

369

D'un pali q'es ab aur batuz.

It may be pointed out here that this verse corresponds roughly to vs. 131 of the *Passio metrica sanctorum Fidis et Caprasii* (source of the *Chanson* and published in vol. II of the Hoepffner-Alfaric edition [Strasbourg, 1927]):

Vestem vestitem gemmis auroque politam . . .

The Latin version, however, is of no assistance in assigning a meaning to our phrase because, in the first place, the *Chanson* very obviously does not give a faithful rendition of the *Passio* and, secondly, the sense of the Latin past participle—something like “adorned, resplendent”—is too vague to afford the precision we are seeking concerning *batut*.

<sup>5</sup> Ed. E. S. Tyler, New York, 1919.

<sup>6</sup> The few exceptions to this statement are doubtless to be ascribed to the influence of the frequently occurring poetic order.

*batu* no explicit indication that the gold involved was in the form of either thread or leaf. What we are really concerned with here is a hitherto neglected meaning of the verb *batre*, which might, when used in connection with gold, signify the ornamental fixation or application of that metal, in some yet to be determined manner, upon objects. *Batre* is to be found in this sense in its active forms as well as in the past participle:

A Gautier de Laon, sellier . . . pour battre 14 aunes de cendal des armes nostre sire le Roy. . . .

Geoffroi de Fleuri, *Compte pour les six derniers mois de l'année 1316*, p. 17.<sup>7</sup>

From the example just cited it will be noted that *batre* need not be accompanied by the subjunct phrase *a or* in order to have the meaning "ornament with gold." In fact, *batre* frequently occurs in this sense thus unaccompanied. In such cases, however, *a or* appears to remain always implied; there is no evidence that *batre* was ever used in French to express ornamentation with metals or materials other than gold.<sup>8</sup>

Our next step is to determine, if possible, the exact nature of the application or fixation of gold expressed by *batre*. Godefroy, we have seen, believed *a or batu* denoted ornamentation with gold thread, hence embroidery or interweaving.<sup>9</sup> Now, in spite of the

<sup>7</sup> In Douet d'Arcq, *Comptes de l'Argenterie des rois de France* (Paris, 1851).

<sup>8</sup> An example given in Levy's *Supplement Wörterbuch* seems to indicate that the verb had greater extension than this in Provençal:

342 Marmes luzens, pertratz en aut,  
Jent batutz d'azur e d'esmaut.

*Li Pacions de san Porcari*, VI.

<sup>9</sup> With Godefroy's remarks as a point of departure, Emerson (*op. cit.*) arrived at the meanings "woven, adorned, embroidered, trimmed" for *ME. beten*; Constans, in his glossary to the *R. de Troie* (SDAT, 1904-12), translates *pailes a or batues* as "pièces de soie tissues d'or"; Jenkins in his edition of the *Roland* (Boston, 1929) glosses *batu a or* as "ornamented with gold (thread)"; F. Bonnardot in the glossary to the *Miracles de Notre Dame par personnages* (SDAT, 1893) gives "broché d'or"; Miss E. R. Goddard in her work on *Women's Costume in French Texts of the 11th and 12th Centuries* (Baltimore, 1927) associates *a or batu* with *orfrois*, that is, gold lace or braid; Fr. Michel (*Recherches sur le commerce, la fabrication et l'usage des étoffes de soie, d'argent et d'or en Occident* [Paris, 1852-4], II, 389) believed *a or batu* to indicate gold embroidery but supposed *batu* to mean that the threads had been flattened by beating in

fact that he arrived at this conception through a misunderstanding of the relationship of *batu* to *or*, it is still possible that in substance he was right; that is, the meaning of *batre* which we are seeking to determine more precisely may have been "embroider" or "interweave." And, indeed, ground for the belief that this was the fact is to be found in the circumstance that *batre a or* was generally employed in reference to textile materials. We should not, therefore, be justified in dismissing the notion of gold thread before having examined it further.

The possibility that *batre a or* denoted interweaving may be dismissed immediately if we recall the passage we have already cited from the accounts of Geoffroi de Fleuri:

... pour batre 14 aunes de cendal des armes nostre sire le Roy. . . .

Is this not evidence that, whatever the process expressed by *batre*, it was practised on finished cloth, a circumstance which excludes interweaving? Any doubt on this score must be banished by another passage of the same import from the same source:<sup>10</sup>

Item, pour 35 onces de cendaus indes, que l'en bati dessus des armes de France. . . .

Here the presence of *dessus* shows plainly that the ornamentation must have been on the surface of the fabric.<sup>11</sup>

It may be somewhat difficult to see by just what semantic processes *batre* might have come to mean "embroider,"<sup>12</sup> but one can hardly fail to grant the possibility of its having developed such a meaning. But then there is encountered this further and more serious difficulty: if *batre* did have the meaning "embroider," why

order to expose a greater surface of gold. Under *battu* Littré gives: "brocart battu d'or, brocart dans lequel il entre beaucoup d'or"; this has been copied by some lesser dictionaries, but the term appears not to be current in modern French: Littré doubtless derived his definition from Old French examples.

<sup>10</sup> Douet-d'Arcq, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>11</sup> Still another example bearing this out is to be found in Joinville, *Histoire de saint Louis* (ed. N. de Wailly, Paris, 1874), § 94: "... plentei de sergans vestus des armes au conte de Poitiers batues sur cendal. . . ."

<sup>12</sup> Emerson, *op. cit.*, p. 87, notwithstanding; the cases of *braid* and *weave* cannot be considered as analogous to that of *batre*, since the latter in its proper sense does not suggest the kind of movement involved in embroidery.

should its use in this sense have been restricted, as it apparently was,<sup>13</sup> to embroidery with gold?

A stronger objection may be raised in the fact that, while *batre* in the sense of "ornament with gold" is generally found employed in connection with textiles, it was not so used exclusively:

- 4507                   A l'espee ot fuerre molt bon,  
                      ki fu de la dent d'un peisson,  
                      a or batu et tot floré. . . .   *Eneas*.<sup>14</sup>
- 1169                   . . . son elme a or batu. . . .   *Conte de Poitiers*.  
                      . . . un goubelet de lierre bien précieux, battu d'or à la damasquine.  
  *Rabelais, Pantagruel*, iv, 1.

Since in cases like these there can obviously be no question of ornamentation with thread, it would seem that *batre* must have signified some manner of fixation of gold applicable to nontextile as well as to textile material. Nevertheless, this is not an entirely conclusive argument, for *batre* may originally have denoted embroidery and then have been extended to embrace other forms of gold ornamentation which presented somewhat the same aspect.

Now, if *batre a or* did mean "embroider," it must have been synonymous with the equally current term *brouder a or*. The two expressions, however, seem to have been used to designate different things. For example, in an inventory of the armor of Louis X,<sup>15</sup> we find listed: "16 paires de couvertures batues et une non per des armes le Roy, 5 cotes batues des armes le Roy fourrées et une defourées, 3 cotes battues defourées des armes le Roy, 22 penonciaux batus des armes le Roy," and then: "une couverture de gamboisons broudee des armes le Roy." It can hardly be maintained, I think, that the compiler of the inventory, after having used *batu* four times consecutively, shifted to *broudé* merely for the sake of giving variety to his expression: *batre* and *brouder* must have had different significations.

In another inventory, published by Douet d'Arcq,<sup>16</sup> there seems to be the same distinction between the nouns *broderie* and *bateure*:

<sup>13</sup> See *supra*.

<sup>14</sup> Ed. J. Salverda de Grave, Halle, 1891.

<sup>15</sup> Published in Du Cange's *Glossarium* under the word *armatura*.

<sup>16</sup> In *Choix de pièces inédites rel. au règne de Charles VI* (Paris, 1863-4), II, 400 ff.

216. Item, en un coffre de cuir, un parement à cheval, de veloux asuré semé de broderie en façon de genestes et trois grans fleurs de lis d'or de broderie. . . .

220. Item, une couverture à cheval de satin asuré, toute entière doublée de toile à grans fleurs de liz de bateure. . . .

262. Item, XI tant pannons que bannières, sur cendal, d'ouvraige de bateure, aux armes de France. . . .

263. Item, une jacquete de veloux asuré, de vieille façon, toute semée de fleurs de lis de broderie, pourfilée de menues perles.

Patently *bateure* is here used to express the kind of ornamentation resulting from the process indicated by *batre*.

This last circumstance furnishes a clue to the real meaning of *batre a or*; for, although the verb *battre* lost the sense of "ornament with gold" sometime in the course of the sixteenth century,<sup>17</sup> the corresponding noun *batture* may still be used to indicate a kind of gilding. Littré defines this word: "Espèce de dorure, dont l'assiette se fait avec du miel détrempe dans de l'eau de colle et du vinaigre." The *Dictionnaire général* of Hatzfeld, Darmesteter and Thomas gives under *batture*: "Mélange de miel, de vinaigre et d'eau de colle, et quelquefois d'autres substances, qu'on étend, dans certains genres de dorures, sur les parties qui doivent ensuite recevoir l'or. *Par ext.* Le genre de dorure où l'on emploie ce procédé." It now seems hardly possible to doubt that *batre a or* signified the application of gold to an object by means of an adherent mixture (size). This process, let it be noted, could be used in connection with textiles as well as with nonfabric material.<sup>18</sup>

We have yet to consider the origin of our expression. If the compilers of the *Dictionnaire général* are correct in viewing *batture* as a term first applied to size—doubtless because of the action of mixing it (cf. English *batter*)—and then extended to the type of gilding in which size is employed, the verb *batre* may readily have lent itself to expressing the fixation of gold by means of size (*bateure*). However, the interpretation of the *Dictionnaire général* is by no means certain. *Batre* in the sense of "ornament with

<sup>17</sup> The passage from Rabelais cited above is the most recent instance of the use of *battre* in this sense that I have been able to find. Huguet does not list this meaning for *battre* in his *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle* (Paris, 1925—), nor does it appear in the dictionaries of Palsgrave and Cottgrave.

<sup>18</sup> When used in connection with fabrics, the process is, I believe, called "tinsel-printing" in English.



gold" is encountered long before *bateure* may be found in a corresponding sense. And no known example of *bateure* meaning "size" antedates those in which we first find the word meaning "gilding." Moreover, *batture* was never a general term for mixture, but has this sense only in connection with gilding.<sup>19</sup> These considerations lead one to seek a more satisfactory explanation of the matter.

The process signified by *batre a or* consisted of pressing gold leaf upon a surface prepared with size in order to form a figure or design. *Batre* may hence be thought of as having had in our expression the meaning "stamp, impress a figure upon." Now this meaning is quite appropriate to *batre*; it had it in the expression *batre monnaie*,<sup>20</sup> "strike coin." It may be remarked that wherever *batre a or* is accompanied by an indication of the character of the design, the figures are of the same type as might appear on coins—insignia, fleurs-de-lis, stars, heraldic animals, etc. It seems, then, that the use of *batre* in *batre a or* is related to its use in *batre monnaie*; indeed the use in *batre a or* may be simply an extension of that in *batre monnaie*.<sup>21</sup>

V. FREDERIC KOENIG

*The University of Arizona*

<sup>19</sup> English *batter* is a post-verbal; it does not derive from *batture*.

<sup>20</sup> *Batre* has, of course, been replaced by *frapper* in this sense.

<sup>21</sup> La Curne de Ste.-Pelaye gives under *battre* a definition which seems to fit in well with our conclusions: "Vestemens battus en or, vêtements sur lesquels il y avait de l'or appliqué ou imprimé." Numerous examples of *a or batu* are included in the Tobler-Lommatzsch *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, but no attempt is made to define the term. J. Salverda de Grave in the glossary to *Enéas* gives for *batu a or*: "couvert de feuilles d'or." Douet d'Arceq affirms (*Comptes de l'Argenterie*, p. xxiii): "Ce qu'on appelait du cendal battu était l'étoffe sur laquelle on avait appliqué de minces feuilles de métal, or ou argent, découpées en diverses figures." La Borde in his *Notice des émaux, bijoux, etc. du Louvre* (Paris, 1853), includes in his glossary *bateure*, which he defines: "Métal battu, réduit en feuilles minces, qu'on emploie en découpures sur les étoffes et en dorure sur les matières solides, ou bien étiré et aplati, puis enroulé sur un fil de soie, avec lequel on brode des étoffes." This definition seems to have influenced both Godefroy and Littré; it is given verbatim by von Wartburg, who doubtless took it from Godefroy. A. Thomas gives for the *ab aur batut* of the *Chanson de sainte Foi*: "rehaussé par l'application d'or." Hoepffner in his edition renders it by "lamé d'or," thereby following Paul Meyer who translates the term thus in his second edition of the *Flamenca*. Crescini in his *Manualetto provenzale* evades the issue by giving simply: "lavorato ad oro."

HENRY HARLAND, AN AMERICAN FORERUNNER OF  
PROUST

It may seem excessively literal to consider as an American one who was, according to his own story, born in St. Petersburg, brought up in Rome, educated in Paris, and who, after practising the literary profession in London, died at San Remo on the Italian Riviera. To make the legend complete, Henry Harland vainly regarded himself as heir to the baronetcy of Harland of Sproughton, County Suffolk. The *DNB.* and the *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* notwithstanding, it is far more likely that he was born in New York, and certainly he was educated almost entirely here before his entrance into the surrogate's office in New York City.<sup>1</sup> No one contests the fact that his father was a lawyer of Norwich, Connecticut. Almost totally unknown today in his own country, despite the immense popularity of *The Cardinal's Snuff-Box* at the turn of the century (which alone made for him \$75,000), he may be better remembered in England, as the editor of *The Yellow Book* during that periodical's brief and colorful life.

It is, if anything, less fanciful to call him a forerunner of Marcel Proust, though Proust probably never read a line by this now forgotten novelist who died eight years before *A la recherche du temps perdu* began to appear in 1913. Proust's fundamental originality remains unquestioned even today when criticism is beginning to show a less cordial attitude toward the creator of the Guermantes and the Verdurins, of Swann and Charlus. To be sure, his superficial debt to Saint-Simon and the influence that Bergson's theory of time exerted upon him were early recognized. But the very basis of his work, as it became apparent when *Le Temps retrouvé* was posthumously published, is the distinction between the voluntary and the involuntary memory. Proust himself established this fact not only in the last volume of his great work but repeatedly in his correspondence, always insisting that no such distinction is to be found in Bergson. Very likely he was ignorant of the fact that his magic link between the present and the past had been studied by such psychologists as Ribot and Paulhan as early as 1896 and even perceived twenty years earlier by Taine as a phenomenon worthy of study.

<sup>1</sup> See Albert Parry, "Henry Harland: Expatriate," *The Bookman*, LXXVI (1933), 1-10.

Marcel Proust made his discovery quite independently when upon tasting by chance one day a little biscuit dipped in tea he felt himself suddenly carried back to his childhood. In one instant the past was suppressed and he stood, a little boy, beside his grandmother's bed in the very atmosphere of her room as it had not existed since her death many years before. His emotions were precisely those of that day in the otherwise dim past when he had first tasted such a *madeleine* soaked in tea. After a series of such almost mystical experiences, in each of which one of the most significant moments of his childhood or youth was called back to life by some slight sensory perception, Proust formulated a theory. According to him, memory, instead of a carbon copy of the various facts of our life ever ready for reference, is rather an abyss whence the fortuitous repetition of a sensation draws forth fully resuscitated recollections. The identity of sensations releases a spring and permits the past to well up within us. The magic key may be the taste of a tea-drenched biscuit, the clink of a spoon against a saucer, the feeling of an uneven pair of paving blocks underfoot, the touch of a newly starched napkin against one's lips (to take Proust's examples), or any similarly slight stimulus which will obviously be personal to each of us. Rarely does the impulse come through the visual sense; it would seem that the other four senses, about which we have romanticized less, possess a greater revivifying force.

Mais qu'un bruit, qu'une odeur, déjà entendu et respirée jadis le soient de nouveau, à la fois dans le présent et dans le passé, réels sans être actuels, idéaux sans être abstraits, aussitôt l'essence permanente et habituellement cachée des choses se trouve libérée et notre vrai moi qui parfois depuis longtemps, semblait mort, mais ne l'était pas autrement, s'éveille, s'anime en recevant la céleste nourriture qui lui est apportée.<sup>2</sup>

When Proust had proceeded this far and noticed in addition that his most vivid aesthetic impressions always came to him immediately after such sensations, he decided, as he tells us in his last volume, to make his great literary work turn upon such renewals of the past with their power of canceling the effects of time.

That Marcel Proust was particularly susceptible to such automatic evocations of the past not even the psychologists who have most studied this emotional phenomenon would deny. He had the further advantage of spending the last third of his life as an invalid cloistered in a chamber whose now famous cork-lining protected

<sup>2</sup> *Le Temps retrouvé*, II, 16.

him from the present. There he could mull over the past, when he had really lived, and elaborately recreate it in the slow-moving prose of one for whom time, in the ordinary sense, no longer counted. The result was a masterpiece of a type the world had never known.

But Henry Harland's work, in all its lamentable mediocrity, bears witness to a similar sensitivity to involuntary transpositions in time.<sup>3</sup> One must not look for that aspect of his personality in the novels published late in his career when he was carried away by admiration for that other American exile, Henry James. *The Cardinal's Snuff-Box*, *The Lady Paramount*, *My Friend Prospero*, and *The Royal End* are laid in the perfumed bosom of a cosmopolitan society whose artificiality would have made Ouida blush. The Lombard castles, Tuscan villas, and English estates where John Blanchemain, of the oldest English aristocracy, falls in love with Maria-Dolores von Zelt-Neuminster, in which Susanna, Contessa de Sampaolo, woos her handsome cousin Lord Craford or the American heiress Ruth Lydgate spurns a morganatic marriage with Bertram Bertrandoni, King of Altronde, to succumb to the charms of the noble Harry Pontycroft have a sameness that makes them indistinguishable. These romances contain no spontaneous recall of reality. But the short stories written during the nineties in London and some of the early novels of the American period signed with the pseudonym Sidney Luska obviously bear a closer relation to the author's experience.

Two of the stories included in *Comedies and Errors* (1898) are wholly concerned with relating experiences of the subconscious memory. "Rooms" opens with this sentence pronounced by a waiter in a café on the Rouen waterfront: "Would Madame like a little orange-flower water in her milk?" The moment the order is served a spell is cast over the narrator:

It was partly, I daresay, the sight of the dark-blue bottle, but it was chiefly, perhaps, the smell of the orange-flower water, that suddenly, suddenly, whisked my thoughts far away from Rouen, far away from 1897, back ten, twenty, I would rather not count how many years back in the past, to my childhood, to Saint-Graal, and to my grandmother's room in our

---

<sup>3</sup> For other precursors of Proust in this regard, see my study, "La Mémoire involontaire avant Marcel Proust," *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, janvier-mars 1939, pp. 19-36. I wish to express my gratitude to my colleague William York Tindall for originally calling my attention to Harland.

rambling house there. For my grandmother always kept a dark-blue bottle of orange-flower water in her closet, and the air of the room was always faintly sweet with the perfume of it.

Suddenly, suddenly, a sort of ghost of my grandmother's room rose before me; and as I peered into it and about it, a ghost of the old emotion her room used to stir in me rose too, an echo of the old wonder, the old feeling of strangeness and mystery. It was a big room—or, at least, it seemed big to a child—a corner room, on the first floor, with windows on two sides.<sup>4</sup>

Then he describes in detail not only that room but also his uncle Edmond's room and his mother's in the same house. Finally his companion interrupts his reverie by asking if it isn't time they paid the waiter and were off. And so ends "Rooms." As in the case of Proust's first recorded encounter with the involuntary memory, the original emotion, the grandmother, her room and indeed the whole house unfold from an otherwise insignificant perception on the part of one of the senses,—just like those elaborate and colorful flowers (the comparison is Proust's), invented by the Japanese, which blossom from a bit of paper dropped into a glass of water.

The other story, "Tirala-Tirala . . .," is even more Proustian, for Harland assumes a more inquisitive attitude here and we find him even renewing the charm as Marcel Proust was to do. In fact "Tirala-Tirala . . ." begins with a question:

I wonder what the secret of it is—why that little fragment of a musical phrase has always had this instant, irresistible power to move me. The tune of which it formed a part I have never heard. . . . As when I was a child, so now, after all these years, it is a sort of talisman in my hands, a thing to conjure with. . . .

I remember quite clearly the day when I first heard it; quite clearly, though it was more—oh, more than five-and-twenty years ago, and the days that went before and came after it have entirely lost their outlines, and merged into a vague golden blur.<sup>5</sup>

One rainy afternoon during his childhood (even now he can shut his eyes for a moment and "the flavour of that far-away afternoon comes back fresher in my memory than yesterday's") he found in a family store-room an ancient dressing-case containing a tiny music-box in the center. He turned the gilded key and—

The cylinder began to turn—but alas, in silence, or almost in silence, emitting only a faintly audible, rusty gr-r-r-r, a sort of guttural grumble; until, all at once, when I was least expecting it—tirala-tirala—it trilled

<sup>4</sup> *Comedies and Errors*, London, John Lane, 1922, pp. 213-214.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 97.

out clearly, crisply, six silvery notes, and then relapsed into its rusty gr-r-r-r. . . . I dare say, for another, any six notes, struck at haphazard, would signify as much. But for me—ah, if I could seize the sentiment it has for me and translate it into English words, I should have achieved a sort of miracle. For me, it is the voice of a spirit, sighing something unutterable. . . . It is my wishing-cap, my magic carpet, my key to the Castle of Enchantment. . . .

When I was a child the Castle of Enchantment meant—the Future; the great mysterious Future, away, away there, beneath the uttermost horizon, where the sky is luminous with tints of rose and pearl; the ineffable Future when I should be grown-up. . . .

Well, I am grown-up now, and I have seen something of the great world—something of its gold and marble, its cavalcading knights and beautiful princesses. But if I care to dream desirous dreams, I touch my talisman, and wish myself back in the little world of my childhood. Tiralà-tiralà—I breathe it softly, softly; and the sentiment of my childhood comes and fills my room like a fragrance. I am at Saint-Graal again; and my grandmother is seated at her window, knitting; and André is bringing up the milk from the farm; and my cousin Elodie is playing her exercises on the piano; and Hélène and I are walking in the garden—Hélène in her short white frock, with a red sash, and her black hair loose down her back. All round us grow innumerable flowers, and innumerable birds are singing in the air, and the frogs are croaking, croaking in our pond. . . . It is not much, perhaps it is not very wonderful; but oh, how my heart yearns to recover it, how it aches to realize that it never can.\*

Besides the affective memory, as psychologists call it, carried to a point where it is recognized and artificially provoked by means of the banal musical fragment, we find here another discovery which Proust has emphasized. For he too saw that what once evoked the future can later come to evoke the past, while the emotion remains the same. Thus the little phrase from Vinteuil's sonata, which had originally introduced into Swann's life a new concept of beauty, came eventually to symbolize his love for Odette and to make him relive, every time he heard it played, the period in which he still loved her, with all the joys and all the sorrows he then felt.

Another story, "When I am King," published in *Grey Roses* in 1895, rests on a similar evocation through music. The narrator, spending the night in a French port town, drops into a cheap dance hall where an old pianist is playing for sailors to dance.

A dance had ended, and after a breathing spell he began to play an interlude. It was an instance of how tunes, like perfumes, have the power to wake sleeping memories. The tune he was playing now, simple and dreamy

\* *Ibid.*, pp. 104-109.



like a lullaby, and strangely at variance with the surroundings, whisked me off in a twinkling, far from the actual—ten, fifteen years backwards—to my student life in Paris, and set me to thinking, as I had not thought for many a long day, of my hero, friend, and comrade, Edmund Pair; for it was a tune of Pair's composition, a melody he had written to a nursery rhyme, and used to sing a good deal, half in fun, half in earnest, to his lady-love, Godelinette. . . . It was as if fifteen years were erased from my life. The face of Godelinette was palpable before me—pale, with its sad little smile, its bright appealing eyes. Edmund might have been smoking across the table—I could hear his voice, I could have put out my hand and touched him. And all around me were the streets, the lights, the smells, the busy youthful *va-et-vient* of the Latin Quarter. . . .<sup>7</sup>

Of course he finds that the old pianist is his friend Pair who had never met success. In *Du côté de chez Swann* the image of the waking memories finds fuller development:

Et avant que Swann eût eu le temps de comprendre, et de se dire: "C'est la petite phrase de la sonate de Vinteuil, n'écoutons pas!" tous ses souvenirs du temps où Odette était éprise de lui, et qu'il avait réussi jusqu'à ce jour à maintenir invisibles dans les profondeurs de son être, trompés par ce brusque rayon du temps d'amour qu'ils crurent revenu, s'étaient réveillés, et à tire d'aile, étaient remontés lui chanter éperdument, sans pitié pour son infortune présente, les refrains oubliés du bonheur.<sup>8</sup>

Like the French writer, Henry Harland was especially susceptible to music. In his first novel, *As It was Written*, published in New York in 1885, an example of the involuntary memory stands combined with the very Proustian theme of the lover who chooses a certain musical phrase as a symbol of the beloved. Within the first pages of the novel, the young violinist Ernest Neuman tells how, unable to describe his fiancée Veronika in words, he could easily express his idea of her by playing "this heavenly melody from Chopin's Impromptu in C-sharp minor," and he gives the musical notation.<sup>9</sup> Two hundred pages later, long after Veronika's untimely death on the eve of their marriage, Ernest is playing his violin one day with a wild frenzy, playing anything that comes to his mind, losing himself in his music. . . .

Then I heard the passionate wail of Chopin become predominant: the exquisite melody of the *Berceuse*, motives from *Les Polonaises*, and at length the impromptu in C-sharp minor—that to which I have alluded in

<sup>7</sup> *Grey Roses*, London, John Lane, 1902, pp. 137-147.

<sup>8</sup> *Du côté de chez Swann*, II, 183-184.

<sup>9</sup> *As It was Written*, New York, Cassell and Company, 1885, p. 21.

the early part of this narrative, as descriptive of Veronika. Following it, came the songs that Veronika herself had been most prone to sing, Bizet, Pergolese, Schumann, morsels of German folk *lieder*, old French romances. And ever and anon that phrase from the impromptu kept recurring. Everything else seemed to lead up to it. It terminated a brilliant passage by Liszt. It cropped out in the middle of a theme from the *Meistersinger*. And with its every recurrence, the picture of Veronika which it presented to my imagination grew more life-like and palpable, until ere long it was almost as though I saw her standing near me in substantial objective form.<sup>10</sup>

In Proust's first published volume, that youthful work which appeared in Paris in 1896 and contained so many of the themes he was later to orchestrate in *A la recherche du temps perdu*, there is a striking parallel to this scene. After fleeing Paris for fear that she might betray her unexpressed love for a man she hardly knew, Madame de Breyves shuts herself up in a room at the seaside and plays over and over a few bars from the *Meistersinger*, in which, because of having heard them once in his presence, she has embodied her love for M. de Laléande.<sup>11</sup> There is no need to point out the resemblance between this unhappy lady and Swann.

*As It was Written* contains another brief allusion to its author's sensitivity to the memory of the senses, but this time it is the sense of smell that possesses the magic power. Because Ernest used to cross the Hudson every week with Veronika and really came to know and to love her on those ferryings, he says:

The hoboken ferry-boats became to my thinking vastly more interesting than the most romantic of Venetian gondolas; and to this day I cannot sniff the peculiar stuffy odor that always pervades a ferry-boat cabin without being transported back across the years to that happy, happy time.<sup>12</sup>

Again, in *The Yoke of the Thorah*, published in New York in 1887, we see the hero Elias Bacharach finding among some "miscellaneous odds and ends" a little gold pencil that he had thought lost six years ago, soon after he had received it from a New Orleans aunt for his twenty-first birthday.

Holding it in his hand, and examining it a little before putting it into his pocket and going on with his work, Elias felt himself suddenly carried backward, for an instant, to the period with which it was associated.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 227-228.

<sup>11</sup> *Les Plaisirs et les jours*, Paris, Gallimard, 1924, p. 126.

<sup>12</sup> *As It was Written*, p. 26.

Talismanic pencil, that had power to raise the dead, and annihilate the intervening years! There it lay, in shape, weight, color, in length, breadth, thickness, in all its attributes and dimensions, precisely the same as on that far-off birthday morning, when his mother, to whose care his aunt had entrusted it, delivered it to him, neatly boxed up in pasteboard, wrapped in tissue-paper, and sealed with red sealing-wax. How well he remembered! It might have been last week. It might almost have been yesterday. And yet, how much, indeed how much, had happened since. . . . How well he remembered, thanks to this little pencil, precisely the same now as then, quite unchanged.<sup>13</sup>

That, on the other hand, Harland shared Proust's scorn for the voluntary, or ordinary, form of memory and the poverty of its results is apparent from a passage in the story "Castles near Spain," which appeared in *Grey Roses*:

He went on to his journey's end; stopped before the great gilded grille, with its multiplicity of scrolls and flourishes, its coronets and interlaced initials; gazed up the shadowy aisles of plane-trees to the bit of castle gleaming in the sun at the end; remembered the child Hélène, and how he and she had loved each other there, a hundred years ago; and thought of the exiled, worse than widowed woman immured there now: but it was mere remembering, mere thinking, it was mere cerebration. The emotion he had looked for did not come.<sup>14</sup>

Henry Harland could have subscribed unhesitatingly to this statement from the early pages of *Du côté de chez Swann*:

Il en est ainsi de notre passé. C'est peine perdue que nous cherchions à l'évoquer, tous les efforts de notre intelligence sont inutiles. Il est caché hors de son domaine et de sa portée, en quelque objet matériel (en la sensation que nous donnerait cet objet matériel), que nous ne soupçonnons pas. Cet objet, il dépend du hasard que nous le rencontrions avant de mourir, ou que nous ne le rencontrions pas.<sup>15</sup>

Marcel Proust might not have been pleased had he been told that his discovery of what he himself considered as the basis of all his work had been foreshadowed to some extent by a far from first rate writer ten years his senior. Though Henry Harland's total work is less voluminous than Proust's, it contains just as many of these mysterious renewals of the past. In fact, more than any other writer except Baudelaire, in whom Proust recognized a special

<sup>13</sup> *The Yoke of the Torah*, New York, Cassell and Company, 1887, pp. 120-122.

<sup>14</sup> *Grey Roses*, p. 186.

<sup>15</sup> *Du côté de chez Swann*, I, 69.

affinity on this score, Harland shared Proust's peculiar sensitivity to the workings of the involuntary memory. Yet the distance between Harland and Proust remains very great. The former could not be said to have discovered the affective memory since he never fully analyzed his emotions or attempted to put them to the fullest use artistically. It is in just this that Proust's originality lies. He *consciously* explained and utilized a series of *subconscious* experiences.

Toward the end of his vast work, Proust pictures himself some years earlier as on the point of beginning it. While waiting for the end of a musical composition before entering the drawing-room of the Princesse de Guermantes, née Verdurin, he reflects on the insistence with which moments of the past have risen to the surface of late. Then it is that he decides his mission will be to resurrect the unknown past in all its vividness and thus to conquer the ravages of time. He writes in *Le Temps retrouvé*:

Je ne pouvais nier, que vraiment, en ce qui me concernait, quand des impressions vraiment esthétiques m'étaient venues, ç'avait toujours été à la suite de sensations de ce genre. . . . Et déjà je pouvais dire que si c'était chez moi, par l'importance exclusive qu'il prenait, un trait qui m'était personnel, cependant j'étais rassuré en découvrant qu'il s'apparentait à des traits moins marqués, mais reconnaissables, discernables, et au fond assez analogues chez certains écrivains.<sup>10</sup>

Those writers whom he recognizes as having vaguely sensed the possibility of recapturing the past are Chateaubriand, Gérard de Nerval and Baudelaire. And on the threshold of his great undertaking he felt encouraged to find himself placed in what he calls "une filiation aussi noble." Had he known that the relatively obscure American, Henry Harland, had approached even closer to his own discovery, he would have had the assurance, let us hope, not to doubt the nobility of his artistic ancestry.

JUSTIN O'BRIEN

*Columbia University*

---

<sup>10</sup> *Le Temps retrouvé*, II, 81-82.

## SMOLLETT, EDITOR OF VOLTAIRE

The creator of Trunnion and Lismahago was a painstaking and hard-working man with some pretention to erudition who fully deserved to be called "the learned Dr. Smollett." His versatility was unquestioned and for a time he was as well known for his *History of England*, his translations of *Gil Blas* and *Don Quixote*, his editorship of the *Critical Review* and the *British Magazine* as for *Roderick Random* and *Peregrine Pickle*. It seems natural, therefore, to find him, in 1761, becoming joint editor, along with Thomas Francklin, of a complete English translation of Voltaire's *Works*.<sup>1</sup>

We have little exact information on the extent of the work undertaken by the editors. Francklin's contribution seems to have been confined mainly to the translation of Voltaire's dramatic works: the volumes containing these are ascribed on the title-pages to him alone.<sup>2</sup> Smollett's share, as he himself tells us in his

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Mr. de Voltaire. Translated from the French. With notes historical and critical. By Dr. Smollet and others. Printed for J. Newbery, R. Baldwin, etc. London, 1761 (-1769). Vol. I (-XXXVI). Actually vols. 1-35 were published in 1761-65, which should count as the dates of the edition; but an extra volume was added in 1769. A later edition, 1778-1781, contained 38 vols. and was augmented later to include Voltaire's remaining works and a *Life* by Condorcet taken from the Kehl edition. As first advertised (*Public Advertiser*, Feb. 25, 1761) the work was to be published at the rate of one volume per month; the notice, however, omitted to say how many there would be. It is my opinion that, at the time, the editors themselves did not know, and were probably counting on finishing the work in three years (i. e. 36 vols.). In vol. 34 there is a notice "to the Public" which contains a curious *N.B.*—"The next volume, it is imagined, will complete the Works of Voltaire." The whole edition, then, was considered finished after the publication of the 35th volume—on March 1, 1765, according to the *Public Advertiser*. It was one of the conditions of the publishers' contract that the translation was to be made from the "last Geneva edition, published under M. Voltaire's own inspection." This cannot have been other than the Cramer brothers edition of 1756 (See C. Walsh, *A Book-seller of the Last Century*, London, 1885, p. 326 ff. This reference, as well as information regarding the exact publication dates of the translation, I owe to the kindness of Professor Lewis M. Knapp).*

<sup>2</sup> These, numbered I-VII, are also volumes 12-15, 18, 25, 27 of the complete works. Smollett's name is omitted from the title-pages of these volumes, which strengthens the hypothesis that Smollett and Francklin worked apart from each other.

*Letters*, was "a small part of the translation" and "all the notes historical and critical."<sup>3</sup> The latter statement must not be taken at its face value. It so happens that the editors of the translation intended it to be "bound up in two different sets," 1) "prose works" and 2) "dramatic and poetical works."<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the individual volumes of the two sets (each set numbered separately) were published at odd times from 1761 to 1765, receiving upon publication the next available number of the complete series in addition to their own.<sup>5</sup> This would seem to indicate that the sets were edited independently, by men who did not consult each other. Further comparisons have borne this out: the notes in the prose works are quite different from the rest. They are far more abundant; in them the annotator, with one exception,<sup>6</sup> uses the editorial "we,"<sup>7</sup> and in speaking of Voltaire calls him Mr. *de* Voltaire, or more often "our author." His attitude toward the latter is severe: he points out many mistakes and inconsistencies in the original text, yet does not presume to pronounce judgment on the literary value of the individual works.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, the annotator of the drama and poetry leaves out the *particule* in Voltaire's name; his spelling is less modern than that of his fellow-editor ("shou'd," "advanc'd," "oblig'd," "refer'd," etc.); he occasionally uses old forms such as "murthering," and his style is often quite involved. Less tactful than his colleague, he criticizes

\* E. S. Noyes, ed., *The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M. D.*, Letter 60, p. 82. Ralph Griffiths, in his annotated copy of the *Monthly Review*, attributed to Smollett the translation of *Micromégas* (B. C. Nangle, *The Monthly Review*, first series, 1749-1789). To prove that he actually translated this tale would be difficult. The translation could be compared satisfactorily only with that of *Gil Blas*, and one would have to take into consideration the fact that Smollett's manner of translating had probably undergone a change from 1749 to 1761 (for Smollett's translation of *Gil Blas* see my *Smollett et la France*, Paris, 1935, pt. I, ch. 3).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. advertisement at end of vol. x.

<sup>5</sup> The "prose works," clearly numbered I-XXVI, were given the following numbers of the complete set: 1-11, 16, 17, 19-23, 26, 28-31, 34-36. Vols. 24, 32, and 33 contained poetry. For the dramatic works see note 2 above. Vols. 1-13 are dated 1761; vols. 14-24, 1762; vols. 25-31, 1763; vols. 33, 34, 1764; vols. 35, 36, 1765 and 1769.

<sup>6</sup> VII, 197.

<sup>7</sup> XXIII, 18, 50, 104, 145, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Except in vol. XVI, 145, where he condemns as pure bathos a part of Voltaire's Eulogium on the officers who died in the war of 1741.



Voltaire for his poor translations of excerpts from English drama,<sup>9</sup> and, calling "absurd" all comedies written in verse, does not hesitate at times to say that Voltaire's are "very awkwardly and inartificially done," "indifferent," and even "poor."<sup>10</sup> It seems obvious, then, that each editor did his share of the work unaided by the other.<sup>11</sup> But which set was edited by Smollett, and which by Francklin?

A clue is to be found in the drama and poetry. The annotator of these occasionally discusses the various difficulties encountered in translating certain passages from the French, and in so doing uses the pronoun "I."<sup>12</sup> Thus he identifies himself with the translator, whom we *know* to have been Francklin and who was presumably in complete charge of this set.

Smollett thus remains as the annotator of the prose works only. Proof of this assertion is contained in the very notes themselves: they have a Smollettian ring and contain many reminiscences of his vocabulary and style.<sup>13</sup> Certain statements on the gloom and the smells in the churches of Europe, on Sir Robert Walpole and the Whig administration, on Louis XIVth, on Admiral Vernon, and on "king" Theodore of Corsica<sup>14</sup> remind us very forcibly of passages in *Peregrine Pickle*, the *Travels*, and the *History of England*. There are numerous medical "asides," e. g. when Voltaire mentions that Pangloss has lost an ear through contracting a social disease, Smollett's note suggests that this misfortune would be more likely to have happened to his nose and palate.<sup>15</sup> Finally, a conclusive proof, if one were still needed, can be found in the remark: "In the affair off St. Domingo, the number and strength of the ships on both sides were equal, *if we may believe our own eyes*, which were witnesses of the transaction."<sup>16</sup>

Smollett is commonly supposed to have been guilty of lending

<sup>9</sup> xxv, 147-149, 154.

<sup>10</sup> xv, 221; xxvii, 118.

<sup>11</sup> Smollett was not easy to get along with; Francklin was unpopular with most of the literary men of the time (*DNB.*). Neither of them seems to have been fitted for close collaboration of any kind.

<sup>12</sup> xiii, 13; xiv, 122, 241; xv, 97, 105, 191, 242, 256.

<sup>13</sup> iv, 179; viii, 162, etc.

<sup>14</sup> xi, 230; xix, 72-75; vii, 96, 162, 170, 171; xix, 96; xix, 32; xxiii, 123.

<sup>15</sup> xxiii, 15.

<sup>16</sup> xix, 97. The italics are mine.

his name to publications with which he had nothing to do, and, despite his assertion to the contrary,<sup>17</sup> his biographers and critics have been a little too eager to give credence to the accusation. As we have seen, there can be no question that he did participate in the edition of Voltaire; and if he claimed *all* the notes historical and critical he can be excused on the ground that the drama and poetry, for which he was not responsible, called for very little historical and critical annotation. His notes are interesting in that we see in them a historian correcting the statements of another and greater historian, and refuting some of his arguments. No error seems to him too small to be passed over; Highland dress, Pepin le Bref's sons, the geography of Russia, the Romance languages, the explosive properties of gunpowder, the meaning of Latin inscriptions, the remote ancestry of Genghis Khan—all are capable of evoking very learned comments from him. However, it is possible to see in his very zealotry in correcting another historian a kind of "defense mechanism" resulting from wounded pride and chagrin at being almost entirely superseded by Hume as England's most popular historian.<sup>18</sup> Whether reason was on Smollett's side or not, he justifies his comments by numerous references to ancient and modern historians and, in keeping with his rather pontifical pronouncements in the *Critical Review*, he does not hesitate to use the adjectives "frivolous," "unsatisfactory," "chimerical" of many of Voltaire's ways of reasoning, nor to say that the latter's representation of certain facts is "invidious and unjust," or even "a meer fable, rejected by the best historians." Yet his criticism is not always adverse; he occasionally praises Voltaire for the "spirit of independence, candour, and moderation" which he has "so sensibly and elegantly displayed."<sup>19</sup>

Smollett's annotation varies according to the nature of the work he is editing. For instance, he subjects Voltaire's treatment of Ancient History to a great deal of correction and refutation,<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Noyes, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

<sup>18</sup> His *Continuation*, however, was the only good history of contemporary England (c. 1748-1760).

<sup>19</sup> IX, 81. Cf. XXII, 3-4.

<sup>20</sup> It is well known that religion and the religious side of life are practically ignored by Smollett in his writings. Yet when Voltaire attacks the Church, or praises Mohammedanism to the detriment of Christianity, our author seeks as much as possible to make the necessary corrections by

whereas he has little or nothing to add to a comparatively well-documented work such as the *History of Charles XIIth*. Again we find that his notes become more numerous when England and things English are discussed in the text: they increase in direct proportion to his mounting indignation at Voltaire's "French" point of view, especially in the discussion of recent Franco-British wars: "we must give our author leave," he says, "to write like a Frenchman."<sup>21</sup> His predilection, however, lies in the annotation of the tales, which appeal especially to the satirical novelist in him. He applauds whenever Voltaire has a particularly happy illustration of the "follies and foibles" of mankind.<sup>22</sup> On the last page of *Candide* he points out the moral of this tale,<sup>23</sup> and places at the beginning of *Zadig*, *Micromégas*, and the *Travels of Scarmentado* a note explaining the author's design in writing each one of these.<sup>24</sup> It is curious to note to what extent Smollett, as a realistic novelist insisting on strict probability in fiction, looks for inconsistencies in the tales. In general his observations are just, but too often lack imagination and show him to be rather destitute of humor.<sup>25</sup>

The only contemporary comments on Smollett's edition of Voltaire that I have been able to find are those of the two important Reviews of the day, the *Monthly* and the *Critical*. In view of Smollett's connection with the latter, it is not difficult to imagine how his work will fare at the hands of these rival organizations. The *Critical*, expressing its satisfaction that "gentlemen of approved abilities" have united in editing and translating the works of the "celebrated Mr. de Voltaire, the most original, pleasing, and popular writer of his age and country," praises highly the notes for the edition.<sup>26</sup> The article in the *Monthly Review*, however, is of

giving, in the notes, a more objective view of the subject under discussion (I, 171, 282; II, 131).

<sup>21</sup> VIII, 74.

<sup>22</sup> XI, 143, 244; XXIII, 3, 9, 11, 41, 44, 134.

<sup>23</sup> XXIII, 141. Smollett does not spot the literary fraud of the spurious second part of *Candide*, but in his notes he does not value it very highly, criticizing sharply its numerous extravagances (e. g. XXIII, 160, 178, 200).

<sup>24</sup> These notes all begin in the same way: "The [intelligent] reader will at once perceive that this piece . . ." (XI, 129; XI, 253; XVI, 92).

<sup>25</sup> E. g. he takes exception to Voltaire's having *Micromégas*, a giant, travel about on a sunbeam (XI, 256. Cf. also XXXIII, 80, 195).

<sup>26</sup> XI (1761), pp. 377-381. This is the sole criticism on the Smollett edition of Voltaire to be found in the *Critical*; yet the translation took

greater interest, for in it Smollett gets what is probably the most abusive treatment he ever received from the pen of a contemporary critic. It would be easy to impute this to the rivalry existing between the Reviews; yet all of Smollett's works, from the *Regicide* in 1749 to the *Ode to Independence* in 1773, received courteous if sometimes severe treatment in the *Monthly*.<sup>27</sup> This being true, it is curious to come upon a bitter criticism of Smollett.

This article was written by William Kenrick, and its scurrility is thus partly self-explained, for he was undoubtedly as rancorous a knave as it was possible to meet in the Grub Street of the time.<sup>28</sup> In 1758 a poem of his, *Epistles Philosophical and Moral*, was frowned upon by the *Critical Review* for its sceptical tone.<sup>29</sup> Kenrick answered with a pamphlet entitled *A Scrutiny, or the Criticks Criticized*.<sup>30</sup> This in turn was severely treated by the Review, and since that time Kenrick seemed to have borne Smollett a great deal of ill-will. But he refrained for a time from attacking him openly, probably realizing that the latter was no mean opponent and that several well-known writers had felt the lash of his satire.<sup>31</sup> It seems very much in keeping with Kenrick's character that he waited to write his biting review until after Smollett, broken in health and spirits, had left England and could not retaliate.<sup>32</sup> Being himself a translator, Kenrick does bring to light

five years to publish. This is strange, in a review which regularly, month after month, published long accounts of the *Modern Part of a Universal History*, also edited by its collaborator, Smollett.

<sup>27</sup> VIII, 203; XIII, 196; XLIX, 500 (by Ralph Griffiths). XVIII, 289; XXVIII, 249, 359 (by Owen Ruffhead). I, 59; IV, 355 (by John Cleland). XL, 441 (by John Hawkesworth). XVI, 530 (by Oliver Goldsmith). XXXIV, 419 (by John Berkenhout). We now know the authors of these articles—thanks to B. C. Nangle's invaluable Index, already mentioned above.

<sup>28</sup> See *DNB*.

<sup>29</sup> IV, 439-453.

<sup>30</sup> London, 1759. Kenrick himself reviewed his own *Scrutiny*, of course giving himself the better of the argument (*Monthly Review*, XX, 219).

<sup>31</sup> Smollett and Kenrick have something in common: they attacked Fielding, Garrick and others in their works, for much the same reasons; but Smollett's attacks were momentary lapses from grace, whereas Kenrick's were part and parcel of his work as scurrilous pamphleteer and libeller.

<sup>32</sup> Smollett had left England in June. Kenrick's review was published in the *Monthly* for October, 1763 (XXIX, 273-282); 27 volumes of the Voltaire translation had already appeared at this time. Smollett may have written the crushing account (*Critical Review*, XX, 332) of Kenrick's

a certain number of mistranslations, but he magnifies these insignificant mistakes beyond all proportion, and consequently damns the whole English edition of Voltaire as a worthless production. The translators, whom he calls "unknown and desperate braves," have, according to him, "mangled" Voltaire horribly, but what adds to the inhumanity of this treatment is the fact that their work has been carried on "under the sanction of respectable names." And here Kenrick attacks Smollett openly: "For a writer of reputation," he insists, "to consent to be made the forehorse in the team of dulness, and let out his name and fame, to countenance the productions of anonymous blunderers, is making a strange and most illiberal sacrifice to Mammon."

Smollett and Francklin had stated in their foreword that in order to do justice to Voltaire's "merit," and to "supply his defects" they proposed to illustrate their translation with notes which might "correct his mistakes, elucidate his obscurities, point out his beauties, and explain his allusions to the satisfaction of the public." Kenrick's review shows that he was infuriated by this somewhat smug pronouncement; he therefore seized on it in order to humiliate Smollett, pointing with glee to several instances in which Voltaire is censured for something he did not write but which was a blunder of the translator. Here again Kenrick is picking at small things for want of something tangible to criticize. His review is unjust in that it cavils at insignificant details while ignoring good points. I am inclined to agree with him, however, when he criticizes the cavalier manner in which Smollett dismisses some of Voltaire's statements and ideas. Smollett deserved a little to be called by Kenrick a "carping hypercritic, who with the strength of a boy would correct the labors of an Hercules."

Kenrick's review to the contrary, Smollett and Francklin's edition is a very acceptable piece of work. It had the merit of being the first to present to English readers a complete and authorized version (up to 1765) of Voltaire, and accordingly was more popular than any other English translation of the latter's works.<sup>33</sup> It had two editions in the eighteenth century, and "the Smollett trans-

bating *Review of Dr. Johnson's new edition of Shakespeare* (phrases such as: "This Drawcansir of a reviewer" are reminiscent of Smollett's unfortunate attack of Fielding).

<sup>33</sup> According to Ronald S. Crane in "The Diffusion of Voltaire's Writings in England" (*MP.*, Feb. 1923, p. 266).

lation" of certain works such as *Candide* and the *History of Charles XIIth* was often re-edited in the nineteenth. In 1859 in an American edition of the latter work, O. W. Wight, the editor, said: "We have used the translation made by Dr. Smollett and others, printed in London, 1762, diligently comparing it with the original and revising it throughout," and again: "We have used every endeavor to perfect the fine old translation of Charles XII." In 1901 there appeared an English translation in 42 volumes of Voltaire's Works, avowedly taken from Smollett's edition, in which the editor (O. H. G. Leigh) wrote: "The original notes by Dr. Smollett . . . are retained where helpful or in his characteristic vein."<sup>34</sup>

Thus Smollett's (and Francklin's) edition of Voltaire was much more than a mere compilation or a bookseller's venture, and is to be taken far more seriously than has heretofore been the case. The student of Smollett can find in it much that is revealing, whether it concerns the latter's character or his learning.<sup>35</sup>

EUGÈNE JOLIAT

*The University of Iowa*

#### CASTILLO SOLÓRZANO'S *EL CELOSO HASTA LA MUERTE* AND MONTFLEURY'S *ECOLE DES JALOUX*

Looking for a source is like calling your untrained dog: stop whistling and, before long, he will be at your heels.

After convincing myself that Fournel and Rohr were right in rejecting Lope's *Argel fingido*, proposed by Puibusque and von Schack, as the source of Montfleury's *Ecole des Jaloux*, I gave up the search and published my account of the play.<sup>1</sup> Three years

<sup>34</sup> Actually very few of Smollett's notes were retained in this edition.

<sup>35</sup> Prof. Lewis Knapp has very kindly communicated a note which he found in the *Chelmsford Chronicle* for Nov. 8, 1771: "The late Dr. Smollett, a short time before his death, at the particular request of Voltaire, sat to an eminent painter for his portrait, which was transmitted soon after to that celebrated genius, who sent the doctor a handsome diamond ring in return." Voltaire, no doubt, had not seen Smollett's notes! No proof exists for this fanciful anecdote.

<sup>1</sup> In my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, Part III, pp. 289-91.



later Mr. Ernst G. Mathews sent me an article in which he argued that *The False Count* (1682) of Mrs. Aphra Behn was derived from *El celoso hasta la muerte* (1631).<sup>2</sup> As I pointed out to him, this is true only in the sense that Castillo Solórzano's tale inspired Mrs. Behn's source, yet it was his analysis of *El celoso* that enabled me to recognize in it the source that had previously eluded students of Montfleury.

The name and character of the protagonist, Santillane, the chief episode of the play, and even some details of the dialogue were taken from the Spanish story. In both works a Spanish nobleman, hoping to punish and reform a jealous and overbearing husband, has him take a boat trip, ostensibly for pleasure, fall into the hands of men who pretend to be "moros" or Turks, and appear before a valet disguised as a Mohammedan sovereign, who humiliates him, threatens to take his wife into his harem, and finally induces him to promise that he will be jealous no more. For Don Carlos de Borja, Duke of Gandía, Montfleury substituted Carlos, Governor of Cadiz, former lover of Léonor, Santillane's wife, and now engaged to her sister. He changed the scene to Cadiz, had Santillane believe he was taken before the Sultan at Constantinople instead of Mahomad Yafer or Xafer at Algiers, added details that make the story more plausible, reduced the time of the action, and stopped after Santillane had renounced his jealousy, instead of going on, as Castillo Solórzano had done, to tell of his death from suppressed jealousy and his wife's remarriage.

His main originality lies in the fact that the insanely jealous husband he depicts is forced to beg his wife to betray him, for Santillane agrees with those who prefer to be "cocus dix fois, que d'être pendus une." Out of a rambling story from which the idea may be derived that jealousy, though renounced, will cease only with death, Montfleury constructed a three-act comedy centered about a jealous husband forced to realize that his wife's virtue is far superior to his own. What the future will bring to the couple is left to the reader's imagination. The play was successful enough to be acted as late as 1730 and to be translated into German. The influence it had on Mrs. Behn will be shown in the following article.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

<sup>2</sup> It is the ninth *novela* of the *Noches de plazer*.

MONTFLEURY'S *ECOLE DES JALOUX* AND APHRA  
BEHN'S *THE FALSE COUNT*

Professor Lancaster has explained how he rescued me from erroneously tracing Mrs. Behn's *The False Count* (1682) directly to Castillo Solórzano's *El celoso hasta la muerte*. The latter certainly came to Mrs. Behn only through Montfleury's *Ecole des Jaloux* (ca. 1662).

The Carlos-Julia plot in *The False Count* (the other plot, possibly derived from *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, gives the title but is really the subplot) makes use of nearly every detail of the *comédie*, sometimes paraphrasing whole episodes. Carlos, the former lover of Julia (Montfleury's Léonor), is crudely snubbed by the jealous husband, Francisco (Santillane). Guzman (the name is hispaniolized from the French) devises the Turkish mummary to teach the husband a lesson. Francisco is reduced to a mass of cowardly fear, his momentary rebellions are squelched by threats of beating and castration, and he is forced, finally, to beg his wife to cuckold him. "Turkish" speech, as in the French, is actually used in these scenes, whereas in the Spanish tale it is merely said to have been employed.

Mrs. Behn's changes are numerous and most of them are designed to adapt the play to English taste. She adds a few characters—Baltazer, the father of Julia, Clara, the sister (who is merely mentioned in Montfleury), and Petro,—and gives the characters of the other plot some part in the masquerade. For Santillane, the *jaloux*, she substituted Francisco, a jealous base-born English cordwainer naturalized in Seville, a wealthy "cit," whose age and impotence made it, according to the Restoration code, incumbent upon Carlos to cuckold him. Whereas the French Léonor is completely loyal to Santillane, Julia still loves Carlos, and appears, in II, i, to be quite of Carlos's mind. Hence her professions of loyalty in the Turkish scenes (where Carlos, not Guzman, plays the Grand Turk) sound inconsistent and hollow. She never, like her prototype, objects that the joke is carried too far. In the end Francisco, after having abjured his jealousy and having recognized Julia's virtue, as Santillane did in *L'Ecole*, hands his wife over to Carlos. His consolation is that he and Carlos "are upon equal terms, for he makes himself my Cuckold, as he has already made me his;—for, if my memory fail me not, we did once upon a time consummate."

Mrs. Behn's "excellent rattling farce" was not, then, an ingenious elaboration of the famous galley scene in *Les Fourberies de Scapin* or Cyrano's *Le Pédant Joué*.<sup>1</sup> She took over Montfleury's *comédie*, which is tidy, regular (except for a shift of scene), faithful in most details to its Spanish source, and fairly high in moral tone. Her changes were such as many Restoration dramatists thought sufficient to justify a claim of originality. Her play is in the English fashion, irregular,<sup>2</sup> double-plotted, and complicated in intrigue. The new characterization of Francisco, Carlos, and Julia, together with added license in language, eliminated all savor of morality and increased the element of farce.

ERNST G. MATHEWS

University of Illinois

#### FINAL CONSONANT PLUS N-GLIDE IN JALISCO, MEXICO

A linguistic peculiarity, commonly heard in the state of Jalisco, Mexico, is a final voiced *n*-glide which occurs, not only after final *s*, (already reported)<sup>1</sup> but also after final *r* and occasionally *d*. If, according to Ramón Menéndez Pidal,<sup>2</sup> only six final consonants are used in modern Spanish (*d, n, l, r, s, z*), there are but five in Spanish America, and one of these is *n*, which is the final consonant under discussion. The remaining four all tend, at times, to disappear from modern colloquial Spanish-American speech.<sup>3</sup>

The writers, having gone to Mexico recently with a particular ear for this phenomenon, submit the thesis that the tendency to slur or

<sup>1</sup> Montague Summers (*The Works of Aphra Behn*, London, 1915, III, 97) thought it to be.

<sup>2</sup> Besides adding another plot Mrs. Behn represents the capture by the Turks in direct action (IV, 1); Montfleury (II, III) merely has Gusman report it.

<sup>3</sup> Marden, C. C.: "The Phonology of the Spanish Dialect of Mexico City," *PMLA.*, XI (1896), 133. Henríquez Ureña, Pedro: "Observaciones Sobre el Español en América," *RFE.*, VIII (1921), 378. Wright, Leavitt O.: "Final *S* Plus *N*-Glide in Mexico," *MLN.*, XLIX (1934), 18-19.

<sup>2</sup> *Manual de Gramática Histórica Española*, 5a edición, Madrid, 1929, 140.

<sup>3</sup> Henríquez Ureña, *op. cit.*, 365, 372, 373, 376; Marden, *op. cit.*, 118, 119, 130.

drop a final *s*, *d* or *r* is being checked by the subconscious <sup>4</sup> addition of an *n*-glide of varying intensity.

The *n*-glide may follow a stressed final syllable or monosyllable ending in *s* or *z*, as in: ¿*A dónde vasn?* ¿*De dónde esn?* ¿*Qué me dasn?* ¡*Otra vezn!* ¡*Ay Diosn!* *Adiós.*<sup>5</sup> Not only is it used in interrogations and exclamations, but one commonly hears natives of Jalisco count slowly up to ten, adding the extra semi-syllable after the *s*-sound, saying: *dosn*, *tresn*, *seisn* and *diezn*. It also occurs in declaratory statements: *Déjeme en pazn*; *Pos sí, puesn*, and infrequently is it heard after a final unstressed *s*-sound, as in *vamosn*.

We noticed two somewhat different shades of the sound of this final semi-syllable. One shade is accompanied by a drop in the voice pitch, which in musical terminology might be described as approximately a major third. The other shade is accompanied by a distinct rise in the voice pitch which would be represented in music by as great an interval as a major fifth or even a sixth.<sup>5a</sup>

Marden <sup>6</sup> says of the sound: "This *n*-glide is caused by lowering the velum before the *s*-sound is completed; the tongue position remains the same and the stream of breath continues its passage through the nose, thus producing the nasal-glide." But, as we heard it most frequently, the tongue-position shifts a bit, rising at the front against the hard palate to make a clear-cut voiced *n*-sound.

<sup>4</sup> No representation of this speech peculiarity was found in three Mexican dialect novels set in this locality: *Los de Abajo* and *Mala Yerba* by Mariano Azuela; *Los Cristeros* by J. Guadalupe de Anda, nor in the collection of poems by Marcelino Dávalos, *Del Bajío y Arribeñas*. The authors are original residents, and for them the phenomenon seems to hold no interest, since they do not call attention to it.

<sup>5</sup> These examples are exact quotations from the lips of Mexican acquaintances in Jalisco. Testimony from a non-specialist in Mexican linguistics appears in Emma Lindsay Squier's *Gringa—An American Woman in Mexico*, Houghton Mifflin, 1934, 123: "... you say 'Adios-n Adios-n' ... 'Adios' means 'hello' as well as 'good-bye,' and that final *n* they put on the word here is characteristic of Jalisco."

<sup>5a</sup> There is a corresponding rise in the voice pitch in such an English expression as: "Do you want any more?" We may, in interrogation and exclamation, carry the same tone through the first four words, and then raise the pitch on "more" to express the desire for a reply, or carry through the same tone, and then, while saying "more," slur the pitch upward, saying "mo-wer." Or we may, while expressing an affirmation, drop the voice pitch at the end, and say: "I want some more or mo-wer."

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, 133.

Henríquez Ureña<sup>7</sup> speaks of the "ene opaca en el Estado de Jalisco" and says "... la nasalización mexicana podría representarse burdamente como *puessn* (la *ese* es muy larga, nasalizada, y la *ene* es alveolar o dental, pero a veces falta)." We have heard it commonly rendered as *pueeesn*, with a much prolonged vowel, and the *s* clear, though short, followed by a rapidly pronounced *n*. Thus, in the slow counting referred to above, we heard: "*uuuno, dooosn, treeesn, cuaaatro, ciinco, seeeism, sieeete, ooocho, nueeeve, dieeezn*."

In this case, the extra semi-syllable seems almost purposeful, or at least semi-consciously produced, since (1) in the case of counting, it makes all the numerals two syllabled; (2) when used in a question, it seems to demand a reply; and (3) when appended to an exclamation, it adds to the dramatic effect of the expression. But in the case of the pitch drop, the sound may be less consciously produced; and it is at times less distinct, resembling a gentle grunt, with the tongue resting in position for an *n*, but barely pronouncing it. It is at times an unvoiced *n*. Perhaps this is what Henríquez Ureña describes as "ene opaca," occurring after a prolonged *s*, and Nykl tries to represent in the symbols: "*dosŭ, tresŭ, esŭ*," etc.<sup>8</sup>

This speech habit is not limited to Guadalajara, but is heard as far south as Ciudad Guzmán, and northward through the Los Altos region. It was curious to have several Guadalajara residents who were questioned admit having heard it but deny its being a characteristic of local speech, ascribing it rather to the region northeast of Guadalajara. And a resident of a northeast plateau county-seat, Tepatitlán, said that the *n*-glide was an innovation recently imported to mimic the speech of Guadalajara; yet in the same town one of the many who used the *n*-glide was an elderly life-long resident, heard counting to a child and using a very clear *s* plus *n*-glide.<sup>9</sup>

A speech phenomenon not hitherto described to our knowledge is

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, 378.

<sup>8</sup> A. R. Nykl, "Notes on the Spanish of Yucatán, Vera Cruz, and Tlaxcala," *MP.*, xxvii (1930), 458.

<sup>9</sup> Not only does *s* take on a consonantal sound after it, but at times it is preceded by a *t*-sound, as in "*tsí, señor*," when the tongue comes from a resting position to attack an initial *s*-sound. Cf. Henríquez Ureña, *op. cit.*, 376-7, who discusses a similar sound when medial.

the final *r* plus *n*-glide. This was heard in the same region as the *s* plus *n*-glide, and corresponds in production more to the first shade than the second, in that the voice pitch frequently drops unconsciously in the additional semi-syllable, as in: *Voy a cambiar a mi señorn*. However, it is also used with the up-pitch in interrogations and exclamations to add the touch of inquiry or surprise, as in: ¿*De este colorn?* and ¿*Ahoy va a sern?* Furthermore, while we usually expect the final syllable of a question to be pronounced with an interrogatory up-pitch, this little speech-quirk leaves the full wording in the same voice pitch, and then adds an extra semi-syllable in a higher pitch to express the desire for a reply.

Final *d* plus *n*-glide was heard with the same up-pitch and down-pitch, as in: *la paternidadn*, *la tempestadn*, ¿*Es verdadn?* Surely we have here another case of a subconscious semi-syllable supporting a consonant which, when final, tends to weaken or disappear.

LEAVITT O. WRIGHT  
STANLEY L. ROBE

*The University of Oregon*

#### "THE HOURS OF THE PLANETS": AN OBSCURE PASSAGE IN "THE RECLUSE"

In the Lollard interpolated version of the *Ancrene Riwe* known as *The Recluse*,<sup>1</sup> at the end of an early interpolation dealing with the meditations appropriate to the canonical hours, there occurs a passage whose meaning has, until recently, eluded me. I reproduce it here from Pählsson's text, where, very commendably, the punctuation of the MS<sup>2</sup> is followed:

Nou þise houres þat ich haue spoken of . vche man þat haþ taken cristendom owe to haue hem in mynde . as forþ as he may oþer in þouȝth oþer in dede . þat is be in biddynge . and wite ȝe wel who so haþ hem in mynde wiþ goode wille . god nyl nouȝth leten þat he ne wil helpen hym att his nede and teche hym as is best for hym boþe to lyf and to soule .  
Nou to þe houres of þe day men may comen bot nouȝth to þe houres of þe Planeetes . for þat tyme he was pynd . þe houres of þe Planeetes acorden wiþ þe houres of þe day . Þe Planeetes ben þat þe dayes in þe weeke ben

<sup>1</sup> *The Recluse*, edited J. Pählsson, Lund 1911: reprinted with notes, 1918. On the interpolations, see my article in *The Review of English Studies*.

<sup>2</sup> MS Pepys 2498, Magdalene College, Cambridge.



cleped after þat is þe sonne and þe mone and þe fyue sterres þat stonden lowȝer þan any oþere sterres .<sup>3</sup>

The difficulty lies in the interpretation of the phrases which I have italicised. If we amend "acorden" to "acorde(de)n" a possible version would be:

Now men may calculate the hours of the day, but not the hours of the planets; for, at the time of Christ's Passion, the hours of the planets coincided with the hours of the day.

I adhered to this interpretation, although I did not profess to understand it, until my friend and teacher Professor Grattan pointed out to me that, if "for" were taken to mean "with respect to," the following version, superior since it does not necessitate any emendation of the MS reading, became possible:

Now men may calculate the hours of the day, but not, with respect to the time of Christ's Passion, the hours of the planets. The hours of the planets and the hours of the day agree . . .

That this version is the correct one appears from the sections of *The Astrolabe* in which Chaucer distinguishes between "houres equales, that is to seyn, the houres of the klokke" and "houres inequales," by which term, as Skeat explains, Chaucer meant a twelfth of the artificial day or night, which were calculated as of twelve hours each.<sup>4</sup> Chaucer gives a very clear account of "houres inequales" where he writes of

the houres of planetes by ordre as they sitten in the hevens. The first houre inequal of every Saterdag is to Saturne; and the secounde, to Iupiter; the 3, to Mars; the 4, to the Sonne; the 5, to Venus; the 6, to Mercurius; the 7, to the Mone; and thanne agayn, the 8 is to Saturn; the 9, to Iupiter; the 10, to Mars; the 11, to the Sonne; the 12, to Venus; and now is my sonne gon to reste as for that Setterday.<sup>5</sup>

The order in which he names the planets is the order in which they become, at sunrise, "lords of the ascendant," the reverse order of their nearness to the earth.<sup>6</sup> Thus, for Good Friday, the order of the planets, and the hours which they would govern, the "houres inequales" or "hours of the planets," would be

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 18-19.

<sup>4</sup> *The Astrolabe*, edited Skeat, Oxford, 1894, p. 196 and note.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 197.

<sup>6</sup> See, in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, the very valuable introduction to the article "Sun, Moon and Stars."

Venus	Mercury	Moon	Saturn	Jupiter	Mars	Sun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24				

In the "Seventh Letter to Polycarp" attributed by medieval tradition to St. Dionysius the Areopagite, the miraculous nature of the eclipse on Good Friday is said to have consisted in the sun's eclipse in *Paschate*, when the moon is full and in opposition to the sun; in the eclipse's lasting three hours, whereas the moon's passage is normally accelerated in such eclipses; in the moon's passage's being in reverse order, from east to west; in the moon's resumption, after the eclipse, of its normal passage; in the moon's entirely obscuring the sun, though less than the sun; in the fact that stars were seen in the heavens, and that an earthquake occurred; and in the manifestation of the eclipse throughout the earth.<sup>7</sup>

Although no specific reference is made here to any disturbance of the entire planetary system (nor have I found any other patristic authority which gives such a reference), it may well be that the allusion to the appearance of stars during the eclipse either refers to some such tradition already current, or contains the first elements of such a tradition, later to be elaborated.

The last circumstance referred to in the "Letter to Polycarp," the manifestation of the eclipse throughout the earth, appears frequently in the devotional writings of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries in England, where an increasing devotion to the Passion is to be observed, together with a growing tendency to describe the events of the Passion with much imaginative detail. Thus in the *Meditation on the Passion* (which is derived from Rolle's *Meditations*), prefixed to *Three Arrows on Doomsday*, we read:

¶ Thynk on þase wonderes þat fele þat tyme: how creatures þat na witte had forthogth of his dede, and mad sorow on þaire manere, and kid at þai felid his dede ful sare. Þe sone withdrogh hym and wex myrke . . .<sup>8</sup>

and in a similar passage in Julian of Norwich's *Revelations of Divine Love*, where she, too, treats of the eclipse on Good Friday,

<sup>7</sup> Cornelius à Lapide: *Commentarii* viii 541.

<sup>8</sup> Horstmann: *Yorkshire Writers* (London 1895) i 115.

I have observed the only other reference to a disturbance of the planetary system which is known to me:

God of hys goodnes that makyth planettes and the elementes to worke in ther kynde to the blessyd man . and to þe cursyde . ¶ Jn that tyme it was withdraw fro both . wher for it was . þat they that knew hym nott were in sorow that tyme .<sup>9</sup>

There can be little doubt that both Julian of Norwich and the interpolator of *The Recluse* are referring to the same tradition. In the light of the passage just cited from Julian of Norwich<sup>10</sup> there can be little doubt that we should interpret the passage from *The Recluse* thus:

Now men may calculate the hours of the day, but not, with respect to the time of Christ's Passion, the hours of the planets. (Normally) the hours of the planets and the hours of the day agree (but at the time of Christ's Passion, the whole planetary system was disturbed, and the hours of the planets were not operative).

ERIC COLLEDGE

Liverpool

#### THE DOUBLETS OLD ICELANDIC SKYTI: SKYTJA, 'SHOOTER, MARKSMAN.'

Axel Kock (*Skand. Archiv*, I, p. 12) has explained the form *skytja* as an original *jōn*-stem denoting the abstract verbal idea 'Schiessen,' which later passed over into a nomen agentis 'Schütze,' parallel to *hetja* = 'Hetzen' > 'Hetzer.'

Kock's hypothesis, however, still leaves unexplained the reason why a *jōn*-stem *skytja*<sup>1</sup> should have come into existence at all when the normal form *skyti* with identically the same meaning

<sup>9</sup> MS Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, Fonds anglais 40, f. 37v.

<sup>10</sup> The passage may be read in its context in a modernised version in *Revelations of Divine Love*, edited Dom Roger Hudson, London, 1927, p. 51. The editor points out in a note to the passage that the "Saint Dionyse of France" to whom Julian refers is actually St. Dionysius the Areopagite.

<sup>1</sup> In connection with the compositum *ú-skytja* 'bad marksman' instead of normal *ú-skyti* Kock (p. 9) suggests that the *jōn*-stem connotes a disparaging sense as when feminine attributes are applied to males (cf. the proper names *Sturla*, etc. p. 2 ff.).

already existed. There must have been some *reason* for the doublet forms. It will be noted that for *hetja* there is no normal form *\*heti*.

For *kempa* alongside *kappi* 'warrior' Kock offers two possible explanations: viz. (1) *kempa* a loan word from OE *cempa* with retention of the OE suffix *-a* which served as the starting point for the *ön*-inflection in ON (p. 8), (2) *kempa* < *\*kampjōn* = 'Kämpfen' > 'Kämpfer' parallel to *hetja* < *\*hatjōn* = 'Hetzen' > 'Hetzer' (p. 12).

In the latter case Kock identifies OIcel. *kempa* with OSwed. *kampa* on the ground that the conditions under which *mp* was assimilated to *pp* in ON have not yet been satisfactorily determined. But such a discrepancy as *\*kampān* > OIcel. *kappi* and *\*kampjōn* > OIcel. *kempa* seems irreconcilable and therefore OIcel. *kempa* is best explained as due to the OE form *cempa*.

If we assume then that OIcel. *kempa* represents OE *cempa*, we have a very clear reason why a feminine *ön*-stem *kempa* existed alongside the normal *jan*-stem *kappi*.

On the other hand, the explanation of *skytja* as an original *jōn*-stem fails to account for its *existence* alongside the earlier normal form *skyti*. That *skytja* is of later origin than *skyti* seems probable from the fact that *skytja* appears only in the later sagas (cf. Cleasby-Vígfússon); it is not recorded by Larsson (*Ordförrådet*) nor does it occur in the *Elder Edda*,<sup>2</sup> whereas *skyti* appears twice in the *Elder Edda* (*Völ.* 6, 1; 12, 1).

In view of the doublets *skyti*: *skytja* and the apparently later origin of *skytja* a better explanation for the form *skytja* than that offered by Kock is to assume that *skytja* represents an analogical formation after the model of *kempa*, i. e., according to the proportion *kappi*: *kempa* hence *skyti*: *\*skytja*. The *j* of the suffix in *skyt-ja* would naturally be retained, whereas the original *j* of the suffix in *kemp-a* was already lost in OE *cempa* (< *\*kamp-jan*). This formal analogy could have been favored by common semantic factors, for a 'warrior' (*kappi*) would naturally likewise be a 'marksman' (*skyti*). At any rate the two activities could be closely associated.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The form *skytja* as recorded for skaldic poetry is uncertain (cf. Finnur Jónsson, *Lex. Poet.*).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Hildebrandsl. 51<sup>2</sup>, *folc sceotantero*.

This secondary, analogical form *skytja* then, like *kempa*, accorded with the group of (*j*)*ōn*-stems denoting masculine agents, such as *hetja* 'Hetzer.' Under this category Kock (p. 12 ff.) does not mention a single example of a substantive (*j*)*an*-stem as a doublet form in OIcel.,<sup>4</sup> which fact seems to support my contention that the form *skytja* as a doublet for *skyti* represents a secondary, analogical *jōn*-stem rather than a PGic. *jōn*-stem which survived only in ON. A form derived from a PGic. \**skutjōn* does not appear elsewhere in the Old Gic. dialects (cf. Fick under *skut*, *skuta*, etc., pp. 467-8).

The explanation which I here offer for OIcel. *skytja* deserves preference over that offered by Kock in that my hypothesis accounts not only for the feminine *jōn*-stem as applied to males but also for the existence of the *jōn*-stem alongside the normal masculine *jan*-stem *skyti*, a factor which Kock has left out of consideration. Otherwise we may ask: Why was the existence of a (*j*)*ōn*-stem alongside the (*j*)*an*-stem confined to *skytja*:*skyti*? No explanation of doublet forms is satisfactory unless a reason is given for the existence<sup>5</sup> of the abnormal or less regular form. This Kock does only in the case of the pejorative compound *ú-skytja* 'bad marksman' (cf. footnote 1).

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

*The University of Kansas*

#### QUOTATIONS FROM ST. BERNARD IN "THE PARSON'S TALE"

Two quotations in "The Parson's Tale" from St. Bernard which have not hitherto been traced, according to F. N. Robinson,<sup>1</sup> are:

Whil that I lyve I shal have remembrance of the travaillles that oure Lord Crist suffred in prechyng; his werynesse in travaylling, his temptaciouns whan he fasted, his longe wakynges whan he preyde, hise teeres whan that he weep for pitee of good peple; the wo and the shame and the filthe that

<sup>4</sup> Feminine *ōn*-stems appear as doublet forms for *an*-stems in proper names, such as *Sturla*:*Sturli*, but these *ōn*-doublets may be explained with Kock (p. 2 ff.) as feminine attributes (i. e., nick-names).

<sup>5</sup> The question here does not concern *heteroclisis* but a new formation independent of the normal declension.

<sup>1</sup> Chaucer, *Complete Works*, 1933, pp. 876, 878.

men seyden to hym; of the foule spitting that men spitte in his face, of the buffettes that men yaven hym, of the foule mowes, and of the repreves that men to hym seyden; of the nayles with whiche he was nayled to the croys, and of al the remenant of his passioun that he suffred for my synnes, and no thyng for his gilt (lines 256-259);

and "Usage of labour is a greet thyng, for it maketh, as seith Seint Bernard, the laborer to have stronge armes and harde synwes; and slouthe maketh hem feble and tendre" (line 690). The exact sources are St. Bernard's "In Feria IV Hebdomadae Sanctae, Sermo," paragraph 11 (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXXIII, 269)<sup>2</sup> and the "Epistola seu Tractatus ad Fratres de Monte Dei," chapter VIII, paragraph 23 (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXXIV, 323)<sup>3</sup> once attributed to St. Bernard.

A possible source for an unidentified reference to St. Augustine in line 921, "and it was ordeyned that o man sholde have but o womman, and o womman but o man, as seith Seint Augustyn, by manye resouns," is St. Augustine's "De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia," book I, chapter IX (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XLIV, 419).<sup>4</sup>

GEORGE SANDERLIN

*The University of Maine*

#### A CHAUCERIAN (?) FISHERMAN

Mr. McManaway's suggestion<sup>1</sup> of a possible and "conscious echo and adaptation of phrases from the first twelve lines of the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*," in *The Secrets of Angling* (1613) by J[ohn] D[ennys], is both interesting and significant. One wonders,

<sup>2</sup> "Proinde memor ero, quandiu fuero, laborum illorum quos pertulit in praedicando, fatigationum in discurrendo, tentationum in jejunando, vigiliarum in orando, lacrymarum in compatiendo. Recordabor etiam dolorum ejus, conviciorum, sputorum, colaphorum, subsannationum, exprobrationum, clavorum, horumque similium, quae per eum et super eum abundantius transierunt."

<sup>3</sup> "Eodem modo et de labore. Rusticus duos habet nervos, fortes lacertos: exercitatio hoc facit. Sine eum torpere; mollescit."

<sup>4</sup> "Verumtamen magis pertinere ad nuptiarum bonum, non unum et multas, sed unum et unam, satis indicat ipsa prima divinitus facta conjugum copula, ut inde connubia sumerent initium, ubi honestius attenderetur exemplum."

<sup>1</sup> *MLN.*, LIII, 422.



however, whether such Chaucerian influence came to Dennys directly from the *Canterbury Tales*. May it not, rather (and perhaps more probably), have come to Dennys through Sackville's Induction to his part in *A Mirror for Magistrates*, stanzas 1-3?

H. F. SCOTT-THOMAS

Acadia University

A NOTE FOR THE *NED*.

In a recent brief study of Dryden's diction, I found that a study, written in Latin, and published in Paris in 1881, by Alexandre Beljame, "*Quae e Gallicis Verbis in Anglicam Linguam Johannes Dryden Introduxerit*," evidently escaped the notice of the readers for the *NED*. For the following words Beljame indicates a use by Dryden ante-dating the first reference given in the *NED*: *brunette*, *burlesque*, *cajoling*, *carte blanche*, *critique*, *embarrass*, *fatigue*, *incontestable*, *parry*.

To this list may be added two words of the same category, not mentioned by Beljame. The *NED*. entry is given first.

*Cooing*, vbl. sb. The action of the verb *coo*

2. *trans.* See *coo* v. 3, To converse caressingly or amourosly  
1742 Young, *Nt. Th.* VIII, 1272 Let not the Cooings of the World  
allure thee.

It occurs in 1673 in Dryden's *Marriage a la Mode*, III, i. There is  
such cooing and kissing among us, that indeed it is scandalous.

*Dauby*, a. 1. Of the nature of or resembling daub; sticky.

1697, Dryden, *Virg. Georg.*, IV, 54 Th' industrious Kind with dawby  
Wax and Flow'rs the Chinks have lin'd.

It occurs in Dryden, *Annus Mirabilis*, sec. 148. Some of the gall'd  
ropes with dauby marling bind.

E. A. HAMMETT

Mississippi Delta State  
Teachers' College

THE MEANING OF "GODS" IN *PARADISE LOST*

Although a few individual passages have been annotated, no editor has considered as a whole the problem of what Milton meant by "god" or "gods" in *Paradise Lost*.<sup>1</sup> In most cases the meaning is clear from the context, yet there are a number of passages that call for comment. "Gods" may mean: (1) angelic beings; (2) classic gods; (3) gods other than the classic gods or Jehovah.

## I. Angelic Beings

This is the most common meaning. Throughout the poem the angels both of God and of Satan are referred to as "gods:"<sup>2</sup>

[God speaks to the angels] But all ye Gods. . . .  
Adore the Son, and honour him as mee. (III, 341)

In this category the following passages need comment:

1. A Goddess arm'd  
Out of thy [Satan's] head I sprung. (II, 757)

The birth of Sin is so obviously modeled on the birth of Athene that "goddess" might here be thought to have a classic significance.<sup>3</sup> Since, however, spirits "can either sex assume," "goddess" may appropriately describe an angel, as when Satan says to Eve:

Taste this and be henceforth among the Gods  
Thyself a Goddess. (V, 77)

2. Forbidd'n here, it [the apple] seems, as only fit  
For Gods, yet able to make Gods of Men. (V, 69)

ye shall be as Gods  
Knowing both Good and Evil as they know. (IX, 708)

These two passages from Satan's temptation of Eve involve the problem of the meaning of the plural form "Elohim" (gods) in the Hebrew text on which they are based.<sup>4</sup> Milton's choice among the many interpretations is made clear by the following:

<sup>1</sup> I exclude references to God the Father, which are always self-evident.

<sup>2</sup> I, 116, 138, 240, 570, 629; II, 352, 391, 757; III, 341; IV, 526; V, 60, 70-81, 117; VI, 156, 452; VII, 329; IX, 100, 164, 489, 547, 708-718, 732, 804, 838, 866; X, 90, 502; XI, 271, 615.

<sup>3</sup> See also V, 77; IX, 546, 732.

<sup>4</sup> *Genesis*, 3, 5; 3, 22.

[God speaks to the angels]  
 O Sons, like one of us Man is become  
 To know both Good and Evil, since his taste  
 Of that defended Fruit. (xi, 84)

"Us" cannot here be the "plural of excellence," as God the Father never speaks of himself in the plural.<sup>5</sup> In the above passages, therefore, "gods" mean angels.<sup>6</sup>

3. Evil into the mind of God or Man  
 May come and go, so unapprov'd, and leave  
 No spot or blame behind. (v, 117)

Of this passage Saurat writes, "Terrible words, applied to God."<sup>7</sup> Saurat misinterprets; "god" as usual means angel, as the context makes clear. Adam is reassuring Eve in regard to her evil dream; he explains that any man or even any angel might have such a thing happen to him without blame. Adam cannot possibly know what goes on within the mind of God the Father. This statement is not invalidated by the passages in Raphael's narrative to Adam where the angel reports dialogues between the Father and the Son, since Raphael has been directly commissioned to explain matters to Adam, and may therefore be supposed to have been inspired with the necessary knowledge. This circumstance is illustrated clearly in the vision of the future revealed to Adam by Michael.

4. sciential sap [of the tree of knowledge] deriv'd  
 From Nectar, drink of Gods. (ix, 837)

Nectar is the drink of the angels.<sup>8</sup>

5. [Satan] The whole Battalion views, thir order due,  
 Thir visages and stature as of Gods. (i, 569)

Satan finds that his followers, though doubtless as changed in appearance as he and Beelzebub were, are still recognizable as angelic beings. Milton can hardly be thinking of the classic gods, since the whole army of Satan is involved.

<sup>5</sup> See for example III, 341, the first quotation in this article.

<sup>6</sup> There is an inconsistency, probably a mere inadvertence, in the following:

inducement strong  
 To us [Adam and Eve] as likely tasting to attain  
 Proportional ascent, which cannot be  
 But to be Gods, or Angels Demi-Gods. (ix, 934)

<sup>7</sup> Milton: *Man and Thinker*, 133.

<sup>8</sup> For example, v, 426-8; v, 632-3.

On two occasions Milton refers to the angels not as gods, but as demi-gods.<sup>9</sup>

## II. Classic Gods

In several passages "gods" must refer to the classic gods.<sup>10</sup>

[The race] That fought at *Thebes* and *Ilium*, on each side  
Mixt with auxiliar Gods. (I, 578)

In this category the following passages need comment:

1. thou [Satan] wilt bring me [Sin] soon  
To that new world of light and bliss, among  
The Gods who live at ease. (II, 866)

The reference is here not to the angels, who could not be said to "live at ease" in the newly created world, although they did freely visit it. The phrasing strongly suggests the Olympian gods described by both Homer<sup>11</sup> and Lucretius<sup>12</sup> as living at ease.

2. With Goddess-like demeanour forth she [Eve] went. (VIII, 59)

Milton probably has here a classic goddess in mind, since he later specifically compares Eve to Diana:

[Eve] *Delia's* self  
In gait surpass'd and Goddess-like deport. (IX, 388)

## III. Gods other than the Classic Gods or Jehovah

There remain a number of passages referring to pagan divinities other than those of Greece, or to a Supreme Being.<sup>13</sup>

[Devils] durst fix  
Thir Seats long after next the Seat of God,  
Thir Altars by his Altar, Gods ador'd  
Among the Nations round, and durst a bide  
*Jehovah* thund'ring out of *Sion*.<sup>14</sup> (I, 382)

<sup>9</sup> I, 796; IX, 934.

<sup>10</sup> I, 508, 579; II, 868; III, 470; IV, 714; VII, 40; VIII, 59; IX, 389; XI, 696.

<sup>11</sup> *Iliad*, VI, 138; *Odyssey*, IV, 805.

<sup>12</sup> *De Rerum Natura*, III, 18-24.

<sup>13</sup> I, 384, 435, 475, 481, 489; II, 108, 478; IV, 33; VI, 99, 301, 366; XII, 120, 122, 129.

<sup>14</sup> In this illustration the pagan gods are represented as forms assumed by the leaders of Satan's fallen angels.

In this category the following passages need comment:

1. [Moloch's] look denounc'd  
Desperate revenge, and Battle dangerous  
To less than Gods. (II, 106)

The devils' revenge would not be particularly impressive if it were dangerous only to those beings who were less than angels, that is, men or animals. Only a being of the rank of God the Father would be in no danger from them.

2. [Devils] as a God  
Extol him [Satan] equal to the highest in Heav'n. (II, 478)  
exalted as a God  
Th' Apostate in his Sun-bright Chariot sat  
Idol of Majesty Divine. (VI, 99)

In each case Satan is being ranked above the angels, equal to God the Father.

3. O thou [Sun] that with surpassing Glory crown'd,  
Look'st from thy sole Dominion like the God  
Of this new World. (IV, 32)

Elsewhere Uriel is said to be the regent of the sun,<sup>15</sup> which is described in materialistic terms.<sup>16</sup> Here the personification does not suggest an angelic being, nor could it very well apply to the classic sun-god, who was not the god of the world but a deity inferior to Zeus. Milton seems rather to be thinking of "God" in the sense of the Supreme Being. The Sun is as unrivaled in the world as the God of it would be.

4. [Before they joined battle, Michael and Satan]  
likest Gods they seem'd,  
Stood they or mov'd, in stature, motion, arms  
Fit to decide the Empire of great Heav'n. (VI, 301)

This is a difficult passage. The antagonists cannot here be compared to angels, since they are already angels. The passage is in a section of the poem which is closely modeled on Homer, one of heroic boasting by two heroes before the assembled armies, so that it is possible that Milton here had the classic gods in mind. On the whole, however, I think the passages should be read in the light of the next citation; Michael and Satan are so preeminent among the angels that each seemed like the Supreme Being of heaven.

<sup>15</sup> III, 690.

<sup>16</sup> III, 591 ff.

5. *Adramalech and Asmadai*,  
Two potent Thrones, that to be less than Gods  
Disdain'd. (vi, 365)

Again, they were already angels. In this passage there is not the classic connotation of the one above. Clearly each Throne is ambitious to attain a rank equal to that of God the Father.

THEODORE H. BANKS

Wesleyan University

### THREE UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF ABRAHAM COWLEY

When Abraham Cowley fled to France with the defeated Cavaliers, he left a record of his secretarial duties under Jermyn in a series of letters, most of them addressed to his old school friend, Henry Bennet. Published in 1702,<sup>1</sup> these letters "give a short account of K. Charles II's affairs before he went to be crown'd in *Scotland* in the year 1650, and what Opinion the Cavaliers beyond Sea had of that unlucky Expedition."<sup>2</sup>

It is a pleasure to be able to add to this series two interesting letters with dates earlier than any of the group except the one discovered by Grosart.<sup>3</sup> The letters<sup>4</sup> are addressed to Sir Robert Long, *confidante* of Henrietta Maria and a member of King Charles's Privy Council. He must have been well acquainted with Cowley; in 1651 Cowley and Sir John Berkeley attempted to sell some of the Crown lands in Jersey, and Long as the guardian of

<sup>1</sup> Tom Brown, *Miscellanea Aulica: or, a Collection of State-treatises, never before publish'd* (London, 1702).

<sup>2</sup> *The Complete Works of Abraham Cowley*, ed. Alexander Grosart (Edinburgh, 1881), II, 340.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I, vi.

<sup>4</sup> The letter of 8 April and the letter to Evelyn are published with the kind permission of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Mr. Julian P. Boyd, the librarian of the Society, informs me that nothing is known of the history of these letters save that they came to the Society with the main section of the Simon Gratz collection in 1922. The letter to Long of 12 February is transcribed from a facsimile in Maggs Brothers Catalogue No. 317 (November-December, 1913). Interestingly enough, letters from Sir Richard Browne to Long, written from Paris on the same expedition in 1649 and 1650, are listed and partially quoted in Catalogues 421 and 441.



the King's purse would have been in close touch with the agents. After the Restoration, Long was one of the trustees for Henrietta Maria when the manor of Oldcourt was assigned to Cowley.

Paris. Apr: 8: 1650.

Sir,

It is impossible to guesse, w<sup>th</sup>out equall danger on both parts of being deceived, what will bee the issue of the present troubles in France; soe much depends upon the success of the seige of Bellegarde, where if the Court have the good fortune to goe through w<sup>th</sup> their busines, they will have opened a faire way to the settlement of the whole Kingdome, but on <the contrary> \* the miscarriage before y<sup>t</sup> place will in all probability bee very fatall to them, for there is soe great an indisposition every where y<sup>t</sup> if the Physick work not very well it will make the disease much more dangerous. The third of this month they opened the trenches before the Town, and the Cardinall himselfe was soe busy at the work y<sup>t</sup> an officer who stood close by his side was dangerously shot; Those of the Town hung out a flag w<sup>th</sup> this Motto, La Liberte des Princes où la Mort; and seem yet to bee in the resolution of defending themselves to the utmost; but unlesse the Mareschall <de Turrine> bee made able by great assistance from the Spaniard or out of Germany (from whence hee expects some troopes) to releive them, they must infallibly perish, for though many in France would bee ready to follow their good fortune, there are none will venture to stirre in <their> behalves w<sup>th</sup> out y<sup>t</sup> encouragement; I think I told you in my last y<sup>t</sup> the Dutchesse of Bullion had made an escape, but shee has had the ill fortune to bee taken again, and is now Prisoner in the Bastille. Shee had for about a fortnights time hid her selfe in the Polish Ambassadors Howse, where I know not upon what suspition shee was searcht for, and found at last naked in an hute, which was not big enough to hold her cloths and all, the disorders in Provence are renewed, but upon the old score of their discontents against the Conte d'Halets their Governour; not for the Prince's sake, whose imprisonment was received there \* w<sup>th</sup> great even publique demonstrations of joy, I think, because their ' governour is of near kindred to the Prince of Conde. The Conte d'Halets would have come into Marseilles but was refused entrance, and the Captaine <of his guards> shot dead by his side from the Town, w<sup>ch</sup> has put both parties into open hostility again. I am conscious y<sup>t</sup> it is not very decent to interrupt you w<sup>th</sup> theise things of soe much consideration to us, when you \* <are> busy about y<sup>t</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> concernes us more then any thing else now in the world, w<sup>ch</sup> is the Scotch Treaty; if y<sup>t</sup> happen not to succeed wee shall have leysure enough for curiosity in the affaires of other Coun-

\* Pointed brackets indicate words inserted above the line in the manuscript.

\* Written over "their".

' Written over some other word, probably "there".

\* Written over some other word.

tries, for wee are not likely to have any thing more to doe in our own; This is soe dear to all people, y<sup>t</sup> I dare say besides some few at y<sup>r</sup> Court, and the Independants in England, there are not twenty persons in the world y<sup>t</sup> wish not an agreement on any conditions whatsoever, if good ones cannot bee obtained. In my opinion none can bee bad, y<sup>t</sup> shall shall [sic] put a sword into the King's hands; soe y<sup>t</sup> whilst other mens prayer is y<sup>t</sup> the Scots may be moderate, mine is onely, y<sup>t</sup> wee may bee wise, and then after a warre of two or three years wee shall find little inconvenience of an hard bargain now. I beg y<sup>r</sup> pardon for the freedome of this discourse w<sup>ch</sup> is so unnecessary to you, or if <it> were otherwise, might yet perhaps savour too much of boldness in,

Y<sup>r</sup> most obedient

Servant

A Cowley

I send you in a paquet by it selfe  
a Letter to the King from y<sup>e</sup> Duke  
& Senate of Venice, it came from  
Mr. Killigrew.

Sir,

As I was burning by my Lords command all y<sup>r</sup> Letters to him, having by chance bound up y<sup>r</sup> Cypher w<sup>th</sup> them; I forgot y<sup>t</sup> I had put it up w<sup>th</sup> y<sup>r</sup> last Letter w<sup>ch</sup> I had newly decypherd, and soe burnt y<sup>t</sup> too, wherefore I desire you would bee pleased to use hereafter the Cypher betwixt my Lord of Ormond and your selfe, unlesse you think fit to command a copy of our old one to bee sent to mee; in the mean time I remember enough of it to decypher the Letters w<sup>ch</sup> you <may> happen to write before this come to you, soe y<sup>t</sup> <it can> \* beget noe inconvenience; for I want onely some of the names.

[Note on page 4 in another hand]

Mr Cooley of 8<sup>th</sup> of Aprill 1650

---

Receyued the 14<sup>th</sup>

[Address] For the right Hon<sup>ble</sup>  
M<sup>r</sup> Long

The second letter reads:

Paris. Febr: 12: 1650:

Sir

There is not any thing of news come from England since my last and then there was soe little, that the Diurnall from London does not speak one word of ether of y<sup>e</sup> three Kingdomes. My lady Mother tells mee y<sup>t</sup> shee has seen a Letter this week out of Holland, from S<sup>r</sup> Alexandre Humes w<sup>ch</sup> says y<sup>t</sup> my Lord Montrose has embarqued 1500 foot, and 800 horse, and was himselfe actually past w<sup>th</sup> them into Scotland; but I hear yet noe other confirmation of it. Wee expect the french Court here next weeke, their busines in Normandy is finished, the Dutchess of Longueville is gone

---

\* Written over some other word.

from Diepe into Holland or Flanders (as is conceived) and the Duke Richelieu hath made his peace, and will come up to the Court this week, w<sup>ch</sup> does not intend to stay in this place, but remove, as their busines shall guide them, ether into Picardy, if the Spaniards appear in any <sup>10</sup> considerable body upon y<sup>t</sup> frontiere (for w<sup>ch</sup> purpose they are said to be gathering together) or into Champagne and Burgundy, where the beginnings on the part of the Princes freinds, are yet but very faint, and not like to cost the King more trouble then those in Normandy; a place or two has already submitted, and it is beleived here that the Duke of Boullion hath likewise made his agreement, w<sup>ch</sup> probably will ether draw in, or destroy the Mareschal de Turenne, who is in the most considerable condition of any y<sup>t</sup> have yet appeared for the Princes. There is noe cause at present why I should presume to enlarge this trouble to you, I am

S<sup>r</sup>  
Y<sup>r</sup> most obedient  
Servant  
A. Cowley

In the third letter we find "the one kind of prose wherein Mr. Cowley was excellent, and that is his Letters to his private Friends. In these he always expressed the native Tenderness and innocent Gaiety of his Mind."<sup>11</sup> The letter is addressed to John Evelyn, one of Cowley's few intimate friends, and helps to fill the gap in the Cowley-Evelyn correspondence between 29 March 1663 and 13 May 1667.<sup>12</sup>

The winter of 1663-1664 was a bad one for Cowley in his rural retreat. The marshy countryside made him ill; Evelyn records, 2 January 1633/4: "To Barn Elms, to see Abraham Cowley after his sickness; and returned that evening to London."<sup>13</sup> This Cowley letter is a most graceful and friendly acknowledgment of the dedication to him of Evelyn's second edition of *Kalendarium Hortense*.

Lond̃. March 7. 1664.

S<sup>r</sup>,

As I have long had many obligations to you for very great Civilities, soe

<sup>10</sup> Written over the beginning of some other word.

<sup>11</sup> *The Works of Mr. Abraham Cowley*: In Two Volumes, edited by Archbishop Sprat (Tenth edition, London, 1707), p. xxx.

<sup>12</sup> The first one may be found in Arthur H. Nethercot, *Abraham Cowley: The Muse's Hannibal* (Oxford, 1931), p. 237, and the second one in Grosart, I, lxxvii-viii.

<sup>13</sup> *The Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S.*, edited by William Bray, Esq. (London and New York, n. d.), p. 263.

I find them now increased beyond the reach of my thanks by the present you have bin pleased to make mee of y<sup>r</sup> most excellent and usefull Book, and more especially for the extraordinary honour you have done mee in adorning my Name w<sup>th</sup> the addresse of one part of it, and w<sup>th</sup> illustrious testimonies of y<sup>r</sup> affection and esteem. I am soe farre from repining at the iudgment of those Gentlemen who think it above my condition or desert, y<sup>t</sup> noe man liveing can bee more Modest for me, then I find too much cause to bee for my selfe. I designed noe other advantages by my Country Retreat but y<sup>t</sup> of Quiet, and little imagined the gaining of Fame too in the obscurity of it. You have most liberally bestowed y<sup>t</sup> upon mee and confirmed my love to this kind of Life, notwithstanding all the discouragements of Sicknes w<sup>ch</sup> I have met w<sup>th</sup> hitherto. I have had the ill fortune at my beginning to fall into an unhealthfull place but <in> recompence have gotten<sup>14</sup> a freind who gives Immortality, for w<sup>ch</sup>, and many other favours, (besides my great respects to y<sup>r</sup> abilities and industry) I am

Sr,

Y<sup>r</sup> most obliged and  
most obedient Servant  
A Cowley.

Give me leave to present here my  
most humble Service to y<sup>r</sup> Lady, &  
Sr. R. Brown.

[Note in another hand on reverse side of page]

From Mr: Cowley 7<sup>th</sup> Mar.

166 $\frac{3}{4}$

upon my Dedication of  
my Calendaria

55

iu

HOWARD P. VINCENT

*Hillsdale College,  
Hillsdale, Michigan*

## TWO POEMS ASCRIBED TO ROCHESTER

The only reliable edition of Rochester's work is that edited by Rymer and published by Tonson in 1691. The poet's two modern editors have been forced to seek out other possibly Rochesterian verses in a mass of dubious poems, including forgeries, false attributions, and even poems by minor Elizabethans. Despite their best efforts, they have not always succeeded.<sup>1</sup> Of the two poems

<sup>14</sup> Written above a scratched out word.

<sup>1</sup> For example, John Hayward (*Collected Works of . . . Rochester*, 1926) published as Rochester's two poems by Thomas Randolph: "Upon Love

to be discussed here, neither appears in the edition of 1691, both have recently been ascribed to Rochester, and both, I am convinced, are the work of other writers.

The "Song" ("Since Death on all Lays his Impartial Hand") reprinted by Hayward as Rochester's,<sup>2</sup> was first attributed to Rochester by the publishers of the *Examen Miscellaneum* of 1702, Hayward's source. The poem does not appear in any of the early editions of Rochester's work. Hayward failed to note that, with minor textual variants, it is identical with Etherege's "The Libertine," first attributed to that poet in *Miscellaneous Works, written by His Grace, George, Late Duke of Buckingham*, 1704, whence Verity took it for his edition of Etherege.<sup>3</sup> Although the two contemporary ascriptions seem to balance each other, and the final determination of authorship must be left to the future editor of Etherege, I am convinced that this is his work. Certainly it is much more in the limpid style of "gentle George" than the spirited force of Rochester.<sup>4</sup>

Hayward reprints, also, a poem entitled "The Imperfect Enjoyment," beginning "Fruition was the Question in Debate," and taken from *Miscellaneous Works of . . . Rochester and Roscommon*, 1707.<sup>5</sup> The same poem, under the same title, is reprinted by Johns, but taken from *The Works of Rochester, Roscommon and Dorset, etc.*, 1739.<sup>6</sup> A casual reading suffices to show that this is merely a turgid paraphrase of Etherege's poem by the same title.<sup>7</sup>

Fondly Refus'd for Conscience Sake," and a truncated version (134 lines) of "A Pastoral Courtship." G. Thorn-Drury, in his *Poems of Thomas Randolph*, 1929, pointed out the erroneous attribution. Similarly, Hayward reprinted as Rochester's, three poems by Aphra Behn: "The Disappointment" ("One Day the Amorous Lysander"), "On A Juniper Tree Cut Down to Make Busks," and "On the Death of Mr. Grenhill." That these were by Aphra Behn has been conclusively shown by Montague Summers in his edition of her works (1915, vi, 148, 151, 178). Quilter Johns reprinted all five poems as Rochester's in his edition of that poet in 1933.

<sup>2</sup> Hayward, 134-135.

<sup>3</sup> A. Wilson Verity, *The Works of Sir George Etherege*, 1888, 399-400.

<sup>4</sup> I acknowledge with gratitude my debt to H. F. B. Brett-Smith, whose edition of Etherege's poems is in preparation. Brett-Smith believes that "The Libertine" is "in all reasonable probability" by Etherege.

<sup>5</sup> Hayward, 116.

<sup>6</sup> Johns, 114. It is interesting to note that the verses appeared without an author's name in Dryden's *Miscellany Poems*, 4th ed., 1716, vol. iv, 187.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Verity, 397-399. There seems to be no doubt of Etherege's author-

Like *Etherege's* it is written in heroic couplets; it is forty-eight lines long to *Etherege's* fifty; it deals with the same erotic situation, the effect of excess passion; and it makes use of many of the figures and turns of thought used by *Etherege*.

It is difficult to believe that Rochester would have written so obvious, and so bad, an imitation of his friend's work. If he ever had so intended, the result would be, more plausibly, the poem commonly ascribed to Rochester, beginning, "Naked she lay, claspt in my longing Arms." In various early editions of Rochester's work, this poem is entitled "The Imperfect Enjoyment" or "The Disappointment."<sup>8</sup> It is quite possible that the poem discussed here was written by some anonymous poetaster, and attracted into the Rochester canon by this duplication of themes and confusion of titles.

J. HAROLD WILSON

Ohio State University

---

#### THE WALPOLE-CHATTERTON CONTROVERSY

The details of the Walpole-Chatterton controversy have long since been presented and evaluated, much to Walpole's advantage; but additional verification will not, I believe, be unacceptable. The earliest account of the affair we have had from Walpole is his letter of May 23, 1778, to William Bewley, which is essentially the narrative Walpole later published as *Letter to the Editor of the Miscellanies of Thomas Chatterton* (1779). The first account appeared, however, after George Catcott had publicly implied that Walpole was responsible for Chatterton's failure; and the second, after the editor of *Miscellanies of Thomas Chatterton* had accused Walpole of causing Chatterton's death. Conceivably, therefore, one may be critical of Walpole's account, for the master of Strawberry Hill was eager to protect his public reputation. Most of the correspondence between Chatterton and Walpole has fortunately been preserved and bears out Walpole's story; but since the letter in which Walpole refused Chatterton's request for assistance has

ship here; Brett-Smith's evidence is conclusive. The poem was first printed as *Etherege's* in 1693.

<sup>8</sup> Hayward reprints it (71) under the first title, Johns (166) under the second.



not yet been recovered, we have had to rely upon Walpole's later account of his tenderness—an important point in the controversy.

In one of his MS notebooks, however, Isaac Reed has preserved an account of the controversy as told him by Walpole three months before Catcott's indirect accusation. For essential matters, though perhaps not for details, it serves to substantiate Walpole's later account.

24 February 1777 I visited Mr Horace Walpole when he gave me the following Account of the Transaction between him and Chatterton. That a Parcell came to his Bookseller directed to him inclosing a Poem (one of the Eclogues since published) and a Letter from Chatterton. In the Letter the Writer of it informed him that he lived at Bristol was of Parents in low Circumstances one of whom only was living and that she had with difficulty & not with<sup>t</sup> pinching herself been enabled to put him Clerk to an Attorney. That he disliked his Profession & wished for some situation in which he might be[ttter] follow the bent of his Inclinations & Genius. The Poem which he sent was pretended to be of the Age of Richard the first and to have been lent him by Mr Barret. In the same Letter he likewise said that he could communicate to Mr Walpole if he had encouragement a series of Painters who had flourished at Bristol with a List of their Works. This Mr Walpole thought impossible and having no belief in the Antiquity of the Poem suspected a Design of imposing upon him as an Antiquary by some Person who meant to hold him up to ridicule to the Publick. However on Inquiry being satisfied that the Account Chatterton gave of himself was true he wrote to him a Letter in which he told him that he had no power to provide for him and recommended to him a diligent attention to his Profession which would enable him to pay the Debt of Gratitude he owed to his Mother & at the same time allow him to direct his attention to such pursuits as sho<sup>d</sup> be most agreeable to him. I do not recollect whether any more Letters passed before Chatterton desired the Mss might be returned to him. This request coming just when Mr Walpole was about to set off for France was forgot to be complied with. Soon after Chatterton wrote him another Letter very scurrilous & impertinent in which among other things he said Mr W would not have dared to use him in such a manner if he had not been informed of his situation. The Mss was then returned & the Correspondence ended. Mr Walpole heard no more of Chatterton untill long after when dining with the Royal Academicians Dr Goldsmith was speaking of the Discovery which had been made at Bristol of Antient Poetry he enquired after his Correspondent & was told he was dead having poisoned himself for want. Chatterton Dr Goldsmith said was a profligate abandoned young fellow & was at the time he killed himself almost destroyed by the Venereal Disorder and also was by his Companions distinguished by the Appellation of *the Villain*. In the Letter Mr Walpole wrote to C he informed him that Mr Gray & Mason to whom he had shewn the Poem were of opinion it was not ancient.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Folger MS 632.

This account agrees substantially with Walpole's later comments, particularly in the matter of the missing second letter to Chatterton. Of similar importance is the account of Walpole's reason for being suspicious of Chatterton's intentions. In the *Letter* Walpole wrote, "At first I concluded that somebody having met with my *Anecdotes of Painting* had a mind to laugh at me" (p. 30); and Michael Lort later wrote that Walpole suspected a plan to subject him to public ridicule.<sup>2</sup> That Walpole truly feared public ridicule of his rather feeble antiquarianism, Reed's note seems to attest.

EARL R. WASSERMAN

*The University of Illinois*

---

#### THE REPUTE OF SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

The dislike of eighteenth-century critics for the sonnets of Shakespeare has been well illustrated by Professor Havens;<sup>1</sup> and the change in nineteenth-century critics to an attitude of greater appreciation of the poems is a familiar fact in literary history. It has not, however, been pointed out that there are three distinct stages in this change: a period during which the old condemnation persisted; a period during which appreciation grew but was not strong enough to win for the sonnet equal rank with Milton's; and a period in which their equality with Milton's was generally recognized.<sup>2</sup>

In the first period, 1800-1814, the sonnets received meager praise from critics, were not much reprinted in anthologies, and had no connection with the contemporary popularity of the Shakespearean form. Egerton Brydges, well read in Elizabethan literature, thought them "not among the best of . . . [Shakespeare's] minor

<sup>2</sup> Meyerstein, E. H. W., *Life of Thomas Chatterton* (New York, 1930), 269.

<sup>1</sup> R. D. Havens, *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1922), pp. 480-2.

<sup>2</sup> Milton's sonnets, having been considered the finest English examples in the eighteenth century, continued to furnish a standard for comparison after 1800. See my "The Influence of Milton and Wordsworth on the Early Victorian Sonnet," *ELH.*, v (1938), pp. 225-51, for their standing in the nineteenth century.

poems";<sup>3</sup> Charles Symmons ranked them below Drummond's and then confessed his ignorance of sixteenth-century sonnets.<sup>4</sup> The anthologists, Lofft and Henderson, held similar views, Lofft censuring Shakespeare's structure, Henderson not excepting him from a severe criticism of the earlier writers.<sup>5</sup> Interest in Elizabethan literature was just rising; it was not yet too late for the *Critical Review* to credit Milton with the introduction of the sonnet to England.<sup>6</sup> The strange dissociation between the popular elegiac rime scheme and Shakespeare's poems appears in Kirke White's failure to mention Shakespeare when arguing for the loose form.<sup>7</sup>

From 1813 or 1814 to 1830, the second period, the sonnets were often closely imitated and highly praised. Lord Thurlow anticipated Keats with poems which, in the externals of rime scheme and diction, approached Shakespeare's as nearly as the more famous poet's.<sup>8</sup> Cornelius Webbe, John Hamilton Reynolds, and Thomas

<sup>3</sup> Egerton Brydges and Joseph Haslewood, *The British Bibliographer* (1810-1814), iv, no. 12, p. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Charles Symmons, *The Life of John Milton* (1810), pp. 270-1 and note.

<sup>5</sup> Capel Lofft, *Laura* (1814), i, iii and cxvii; George Henderson, *Petrarca* (1803), pp. vii-viii. Lofft reprints only eight of Shakespeare's sonnets, Henderson only two.

<sup>6</sup> *Critical Review*, 3d ser., vi (1805), 37.

<sup>7</sup> Kirke White, "Melancholy Hours, No. V," *Remains*, ed. Southey (1808), II, 249. Henderson, *op. cit.*, p. xxx, championed the elegiac measure in spite of his condemnation of early sonnets, and the *Critical Review*, 2d ser., xxxiv (1802), 393, supported its plea for this form by citing the success not of Shakespeare but of the sentimental Charlotte Smith.

<sup>8</sup> The following is a typical example from Lord Thurlow's *Poems on Several Occasions*, 2d ed. (1813):

SAY nothing, that, to save thy lightest pain,  
I willingly from out this World would pass;  
Though there indeed my loss must be my gain,  
That for a while must dwell from thee, alas!  
No, even as thyself thy friends are dear;  
Whatever thou hast lov'd from youth till now,  
Is lov'd of me, and in affection near,  
And for their safety I record my vow:  
Never believe, that I am dull at heart,  
When hazard shall be made of thee, and thine,  
But with a perfect soul, and not in part,  
I freely will this balmy air resign:  
O, think but this, whatever love has dar'd,  
For thy sweet sake shall of my love be heir'd.

Hood followed the examples of Lord Thurlow and Keats. Praise was bestowed on the poems by the younger Boswell, who apologized for Malone's unenthusiastic defense of them and said that their merits were "now . . . almost universally acknowledged";<sup>9</sup> and by Nathan Drake, who forgot the strictures he had passed in 1798 and defended them vigorously.<sup>10</sup> Keats, Wordsworth, and Beddoes were of course enthusiastic about them.<sup>11</sup> Three editions of Shakespeare's *Poems* were issued between 1819 and 1821, the time, perhaps, when Elizabethan influence on the sonnet was strongest. On the other hand, the dislike of Elizabethan ornateness continued, for an article in the *Retrospective Review* recommended Shakespeare's non-dramatic poetry but found the sonnets "defective" and concluded that "the best writer of English Sonnets is . . . Milton."<sup>12</sup> The familiar faint praise of the sonnets, "the best . . . anterior to . . . Drummond,"<sup>13</sup> is to be found as late as 1828, and Hazlitt remained hostile.

The appearance of the *Sonnets of Shakespeare and Milton* in 1830 marks the final stage. After this year critics commonly coupled the two names as those of the masters of the English sonnet, and one periodical even argued that Shakespeare's poems possessed more of the "real character of the sonnet" than Milton's or

<sup>9</sup> Boswell's *Malone* (1821), xx, 222 (cf. 363). Malone had at the end of the eighteenth century defended them against George Steevens, who had considered them inferior to those of Watson.

<sup>10</sup> See Nathan Drake, *Shakespeare and His Times* (1817), II, 74-86; cf. Nathan Drake, *Literary Hours*, 3d ed. (1804), I, 107-8. The reviewer of the 1817 work in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXXXVIII, pt. 2 (1818), 335, emphatically agreed with Drake in his new opinion.

<sup>11</sup> See Keats' letter to J. H. Reynolds, November 22, 1817; Wordsworth's "Essay Supplementary to the Preface, 1815," *Prose Works*, ed. Knight, II, 234; Beddoes' letter to Thomas Forbes Kelsall, May 13, 1827. Wordsworth's less favorable remarks about the sonnets in his letter to Sir William Rowan Hamilton, November 22, 1831, may be discounted; they refer to the structure of the sonnets and are in answer to Hamilton's attempt to justify the illegitimate structure of his own sonnets by Shakespeare's example (Hamilton to Wordsworth, November 17, 1831).

<sup>12</sup> *Retrospective Review*, VII (1823), 393. The author criticized the "coldness and quaintness about [the sonnets of] Daniel, Drummond, and Sir Philip Sidney." The *New Monthly*, VII (1823), 473-6, attacked both Shakespeare's and Sidney's sonnets.

<sup>13</sup> *New Monthly*, XXVI (1828), 582.

Wordsworth's.<sup>14</sup> The anthologists Dyce and Woodford printed more sonnets by Shakespeare than by any other writer.<sup>15</sup> Symbolic of Shakespeare's gains is Julian Fane's shift from imitation of Milton to imitation of Shakespeare.<sup>16</sup> Brydges objected, in 1835, that Shakespeare's sonnets had been praised too much, but they were still to be spoken of warmly by Elizabeth Barrett Browning and Edward Fitzgerald.<sup>17</sup> Almost for the first time since Keats' experiments, the structure used by Shakespeare had some influence, and had it because of the connection with Shakespeare.<sup>18</sup> Thomas Campbell, Landor, and Hallam made adverse criticisms of the poems, yet Hallam admitted that "No one ever entered more fully than Shakespeare into the character of this species of poetry."<sup>19</sup> Compared to its position in 1805 or even in 1820,

<sup>14</sup> *Rugby Magazine*, I (1835), 149. Other periodicals which mention Milton and Shakespeare as equals are *Gentleman's Magazine*, CIII, pt. 1 (1833), 618, and *Athenaeum*, May 2, 1835, p. 337.

<sup>15</sup> A. Dyce, *Specimens of English Sonnets* (1833); Montagu A. Woodford, *Book of Sonnets* (1841). Dyce, in the notes to his anthology and in his "Memoir of Shakespeare" prefixed to the Aldine edition of Shakespeare's works, gave the sonnets high praise.

<sup>16</sup> See Robert Bulwer-Lytton, *Julian Fane* (London, 1872), pp. 117 ff. It was around 1860 that Fane turned to the Shakespearean model.

<sup>17</sup> Milton, *Poetical Works*, ed. Brydges (Boston, 1855), p. xcv; E. B. Browning, "The Book of the Poets," *Poetical Works* (London, 1932), p. 627; Fitzgerald to Archdeacon Allen, November [27, 1832]. Brydges' Milton first appeared in 1835, Mrs. Browning's essay in 1842. Fitzgerald was particularly appreciative: "I have been reading Shakespeare's Sonnets . . . I had but half an idea of him, Demigod as he seemed before, till I read them carefully. . . . [They] are perfectly simple, and have the very essence of tenderness that is only to be found in the best parts of his Romeo and Juliet besides." Cf. Coleridge's praise in *Table Talk and Omniana*, ed. T. Ashe (1896), pp. 221-2 (dated May 14, 1833).

<sup>18</sup> Mrs. Caroline Norton in *The Dream; and Other Poems* (New York, 1847), p. 226, argued that the Shakespearean form was "a better English model than that adopted by Milton," pointing out that Shakespeare had evidently considered such a form a true sonnet form; Sir William Rowan Hamilton (letter to Wordsworth, November 17, 1831) cited Shakespeare's rime scheme to excuse his own deviation from the legitimate structure. Although the legitimate form was predominant in theory and practise before 1850, later there were critics who considered the Shakespearean form as correct as the Italian. Cf. *Dublin Review*, n. s. XXVII (1876), 422; William Sharp, *Sonnets of This Century* (1886-1887), p. lii; T. Hall Caine, *Sonnets of Three Centuries* (1882), pp. ix ff.

<sup>19</sup> Arthur Henry Hallam, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe* (New

critical opinion may be seen to have shifted toward a new, high estimate of Shakespeare's sonnets.

GEORGE SANDERLIN

*The University of Maine*

---

FRANKLIN AND WILLIAM PENN'S *NO CROSS, NO CROWN*

The eighty-first number of *The New-England Courant* for the week of 11-18 February 1723 was the second number of the paper published under the name of Benjamin Franklin, after his brother, James, had ostensibly renounced his editorship because of a prohibitive decree of the Massachusetts Council. The leading article of this issue is an amusing satire on honorary titles, and has been accepted by modern biographers as the work of Franklin. Faÿ, for example, quotes from it as "an article certainly written by the younger Franklin,"<sup>1</sup> and Van Doren asserts that it "must have been" by him.<sup>2</sup> Apparently, however, no one has noticed that it is a burlesque of a section from the ninth chapter of William Penn's *No Cross, No Crown* (1669).

The essay purports to be a record of a session of the club to which the new editor of the *Courant*, Benjamin Franklin, belongs. During the course of the meeting, one of the members had read "some Passages from a zealous Author against *Hatt-Honour, Titular Respects*, etc." This phrase will be recognized as part of the long sub-title of Penn's work, *No Cross, No Crown: or several Sober Reasons Against Hat-Honour, Titular-Respects, You to a single Person, with the Apparel and Recreations of the Times . . .*

The passages which the member of the club supposedly quoted are, of course, not actually from Penn's very serious treatise, as the

York, 1880), III, 254. The other references are: Shakespeare, *Dramatic Works*, ed. Thomas Campbell (London, 1866), pp. xxvi-xxvii; Landor, "Southey and Landor," *Works* (London, 1876), IV, 512, and "Southey and Porson," *Works*, IV, 56. Campbell's Shakespeare first appeared in 1838, Hallam's work from 1837 to 1839.

<sup>1</sup> Bernard Faÿ, *Franklin, the Apostle of Modern Times*, Boston, 1929, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Carl Van Doren, *Benjamin Franklin*, New York, 1938, p. 31. Cf. James Parton, *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*, New York, etc., 1864, I, 93.



exaggerated absurdity of the ruse indicates. The fictitious quotation in *The New-England Courant* runs as follows:

In old Time it was no disrespect for Men and Women to be call'd by their own Names: *Adam*, was never called *Master Adam*; we never read of *Noah Esquire*, *Lot Knight* and *Baronet*, nor the *Right Honourable Abraham*, *Viscount Mesopotamia*, *Baron of Canaan*; no, no, they were plain Men, honest Country *Grasiers*, that took Care of their Families and their Flocks. *Moses* was a great Prophet, and *Aaron* a Priest of the Lord; but we never read of the *Reverend Moses*, nor the *Right Reverend Father in God*, *Aaron*, by Divine Providence, *Lord Arch-Bishop of Israel*.

Penn's attack on titles of respect, in *No Cross, No Crown*, actually reads thus:

For if we read the Scriptures, such a Thing as *My Lord Adam*, (though Lord of the World) is not to be found: Nor *My Lord Noah* neither, the *Second Lord* of the Earth: Nor yet *My Lord Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful; nor *My Lord Isaac*; nor *My Lord Jacob*: But much less *My Lord Peter*, and *My Lord Paul*, to be found in the Bible: And less *Your Holiness*, or *Your Grace* . . .<sup>3</sup>

Franklin has obviously elaborated on the idea in order to make it ridiculous, but the paraphrase is sufficiently close to Penn's statement to indicate that the latter is the source of the parody. It is especially significant that the choice of the first three names, Adam, Noah and Abraham (with the exception of Franklin's insertion of Lot) is the same in each case.

It seems impossible to discover exactly how Franklin came to know Penn's *No Cross, No Crown*. Perhaps it was one of the books he purchased with "the little money that came into my hands," or it may have been one of the "books in polemic divinity" in his father's library.<sup>4</sup> It might also have been lent him by one of the booksellers' apprentices, or Mr. Matthew Adams, from whom he frequently borrowed "such books as I chose to read."<sup>5</sup>

A. STUART PITT

New Haven, Connecticut

---

<sup>3</sup> *A Collection of the Works of William Penn*, London, 1726, I, 324.

<sup>4</sup> *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. A. H. Smyth, New York, 1905-7, I, 238 (*Autobiography*).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 239.

DAVID MALLOCH AND *THE EDINBURGH  
MISCELLANY*

Several poets of distinction in the eighteenth century entered the field through the pages of the miscellanies. Such collections, containing as they did pieces of a heterogeneous nature—many printed anonymously,—were an ideal medium for ambitious young poets. David Malloch (he had not yet changed his name to 'Mallet') made his bow to the World in *The Edinburgh Miscellany*.<sup>1</sup> His connection with this volume is not unknown, but is obscure.<sup>2</sup> In the *Miscellany* there is a poem by "a Youth in his Fifteenth Year" and three others signed "D. M." all "By the same hand." There can be little doubt that these are by Malloch. One of them is "A Pastoral, Inscrib'd to Mr. M——l." Malloch wrote to John Ker: "The 'Edinburgh Miscellany' was undertaken by an 'Athenian Society' here, who received the poems [Malloch's], and published all they thought worthy of seeing the light. The gentleman to whom I inscrib'd my *Pastoral* is one of their number. His name is Mr. Joseph Mitchell."<sup>3</sup>

In the four poems Malloch conforms to the taste of his time. The "Pastoral" (pp. 223-8) is followed by another sylvan piece, "The Grove, or Interview" (pp. 232-3). "Chapter II. of Solomon's Song" (pp. 229-31) was obviously written as a love poem, not as an expression of religious feeling. It points to the "Epithalamium on The Marriage of a Friend" (pp. 259-63), which contains some lusciously amorous lines, the more amazing coming from a boy of fifteen. But instead of revealing that Malloch was already an ex-

<sup>1</sup> Volume One was published at Edinburgh in 1720. A second volume was announced, but apparently never appeared. The book is very scarce, the only copy I know of in this country being at the Columbia University Library.

<sup>2</sup> The *DNB*. (xxv, p. 425) mentions the *Edinburgh* and one of the poems, but has obviously been content with Malloch's account as given in a letter to John Ker, quoted below. Even his most conscientious biographer, Frederick Dinsdale (*Ballads and Songs by David Mallet*, London, 1857, p. 19 n.) adds nothing new about the *Miscellany*.

<sup>3</sup> *European Magazine*, xxiii (1793), p. 338. Until the publication of part of the Malloch-Ker correspondence (October, 1720–July, 1727) in the *European*, thirty-three years after Malloch's death, little was known about his early life. The letters were reprinted by Robert Anderson, in *The Works of the British Poets* (London, 1795), ix, 669-70.

perienched follower of Venus it merely is another example of his following the fashion of the time.

The young David was but one flower in a Child's Garden of Verses. For "A. C.," who wrote the Preface to the *Miscellany*, pointed out with pride that he was introducing a new set of future Drydens, and pleaded for a kind reception. In this volume James Thomson attempts to win his spurs. "J. C., a Youth of Fifteen, at the University," has six poems to his credit. Well represented also are The Young Ladies of the Fair Intellectual Club, one of whom begs her audience:

My first Essay in pastoral Excuse,  
Indulge my Genius, and protect my Muse. (p. 183)

Finally, Malloch tells us, in one of the Ker letters, that the five poems ascribed to "S." are by "Mr. Symmers, a boy of fifteen, and very sprightly."

RICHARD BOYS

*Baltimore, Maryland*

## REVIEWS

*Machiavelli's Prince and its Forerunners.* The Prince as a typical book *De Regimine Principum*. By ALLEN H. GILBERT. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1938. Pp. xiii + 266. \$3.00.

It was an English scholar—L. Arthur Burd—who gave a notable contribution to the study of Machiavelli's sources by showing the change that certain ideas of Aristotle underwent in passing through the agile mind of the Florentine. Now Prof. Gilbert has considerably extended the scope of Burd's (and other scholars') researches by including not only the Aristotelian tradition in the Middle Ages (Gilbert is also the author of a study of *Dante's Conception of Justice*), but also what must amount to practically all treatises on the duties of a prince composed in western Europe up to the time of Machiavelli. By means of a wealth of quotation and exact reference, Gilbert is able to show the background of Machiavelli's brief treatise chapter by chapter, and sometimes almost sentence by sentence. After Gilbert's exhaustive and well-digested presentation of evidence, it is impossible not to realise, in full detail, the outstand-

ing difference between Machiavelli's revolutionary realism, which was to shock the conscience of Europe for more than a century, and the trite ethical commonplaces and copy-book maxims of his predecessors. They were never able to free themselves from the purely deontological distinction between the "good" prince and the bad tyrant (though Gilbert shows that in practice they were forced to compromise), while Machiavelli based his distinction of good and bad princes simply on the capacity to hold power, whether the means used were ethically laudable or not. The issues thus raised are still the subject of debate.

Gilbert is also able to correct Burd on some points of detail, such as the interpretation of the word "*uno*" in chapter 3 of the *Prince* (p. 31). Gilbert rightly interprets it, in that context, as "*alcuno*," *anyone*, and not the numeral *one*. On the other hand, reference to Luigi Russo's commentary on the *Prince* shows that "*correggere*" in chapter 7 and elsewhere (p. 43) has frequently the sense of *to govern*, pure and simple. Russo's study follows in the great tradition of de Sanctis' and Croce's interpretation of Machiavelli; while Dilthey's inquiries into Machiavelli's indebtedness to Polybius throw much light on such important questions as the Florentine's attitude to monarchy and republicanism, and the relation of ethics to politics. It is doubtful whether Gilbert would have found much to add by referring to von Mohl's vast but outdated repository of learning, or Ch. Benoist's *Le Machiavélisme avant Machiavel* (1907), which is more concerned with political practice than with political theory. A final word of praise must also be given to the illustrations and to the very full index.

N. ORSINI

*University of Florence, Italy*

---

*Inkle and Yarico. Album selected and arranged by* LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937. Pp. 171. \$2.50.

Il s'agit bien en effet d'un album, d'une série de vignettes illustrant des légendes anglaises, françaises et allemandes et non de l'analyse et de l'étude systématiques d'un thème. Partant du fait apparemment authentique relaté par le voyageur Ligon, en 1657, dans sa *True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados*, M. Price a collectionné avec le soin d'un amateur d'estampes les variantes sentimentales et philosophiques, prêcheuses et indignées qu'il a rencontrées au cours de son enquête à travers trois littératures européennes. Il a retrouvé des traductions en italien, en espagnol, en danois, en hollandais et en latin. Il a étudié avec soin ce qui les distingue, il a marqué les variantes et les emprunts. Il n'a pas

non plus négligé de reproduire en entier quelques pièces rares, onze gravures et pages de titres qui constituent les "embellishments" de son ouvrage. Livre précieux pour les amateurs d'exotisme, l'album est présenté avec un soin typographique trop rare et a droit à une place à part dans nos bibliothèques d'étude. Avec les matériaux qu'il avait découverts, M. Price aurait pu composer un gros volume et "épuiser" le sujet. Qu'il soit loué de ne pas l'avoir fait; mais sa trop grande modestie l'a conduit à se limiter à une présentation un peu sèche qui pourrait conduire le lecteur non averti à "sous-estimer" la valeur et l'importance de ce travail. Ne pouvant tout dire, je me bornerai à quelques points qui me semblent essentiels. Le premier pas est franchi avec la version donnée par Steele, dans le *Spectator*, en 1711. Le récit de Ligon ne dépassait guère la portée d'un fait divers atroce. Un matelot naufragé est recueilli par une jeune indigène qui devient sa maîtresse. Quand, de longs mois plus tard, il est retrouvé par un vaisseau anglais et qu'il rentre dans la civilisation, il vend comme esclave, pour se procurer des ressources, celle qui lui avait sauvé la vie. "And so poor Yarico for her love, lost her liberty." Steele déjà transforme considérablement le récit du simple annaliste. Chez lui nous trouvons déjà une sorte de robinsonnade, la description détaillée de la grotte où se réfugient les deux amants, quelque couleur locale, les promesses trompeuses d'Inkle, des souvenirs des idylles antiques, un décor de pastorale, la poésie de la nuit et le chant du rossignol, sans compter une ironie froide du narrateur. Le fait divers, le "fait de vie" est entré dans la littérature. Il n'était peut-être pas inutile de le faire remarquer. Avec Dorat et surtout avec Chamfort, en France, l'anecdote revêt une signification entièrement différente.

Encore ici conviendrait-il peut-être d'ajouter un supplément d'information à l'enquête conduite par M. Price. Selon les *Mémoires secrets de la République des Lettres* (26 juillet 1765), Dorat et Chamfort se seraient inspirés d'une héroïne intitulée *Cléone à Cynéas*, publiée pour la première fois en 1759 et dont la seconde édition parut en 1764, à Leipsick, dans le recueil "*Moralische Briefe zur Bildung des Herzens* etc." Mais ils seraient "restés bien au-dessous de l'original du côté du naturel et de ce sentiment triste et profond qui empreint chaque ligne de l'allemand." Je n'ai pu consulter cet original, mais on en trouvera la traduction dans la *Gazette littéraire de l'Europe*, VI, 174, 15 juillet 1765. L'auteur allemand, "M. Dusch," a en tout cas généralisé l'anecdote, supprimé toute couleur locale, donné une couleur ovidienne aux plaintes de la pauvre délaissée qui, au lieu d'une simple sauvagesse, devient une fille-mère abandonnée par un perfide amant. C'est, en tout cas, vers cette date qu'apparaît simultanément en Allemagne, en Angleterre et en France un des thèmes essentiels de l'exotisme sentimental, le thème du départ et de la séparation inévitable. Déjà est esquissé le problème fondamental qui trouble les idylles

coloniales dont sont victimes tant de "petites épouses" dans les romans modernes. Dans son dernier chapitre qui a pour titre *In Memoriam*, M. Price s'est attaché à retracer l'histoire littéraire de la postérité d'Yarico. Il avait sans doute les meilleurs raisons du monde pour s'arrêter aux environs de 1810. Il n'en est pas moins certain que la pauvre Indienne vendue à la Barbade par une ingrate brute est une ancêtre lointaine, mais authentique, de Rarahu et de la Fatou Gaye de Loti.

GILBERT CHINARD

Princeton University

*Uhtred de Boldon, Friar William Jordan, and "Piers Plowman."*

By MILDRED ELIZABETH MARCETT. Published by the Author, New York University, 1938. Pp. vii + 75.

This dissertation stirs the ashes of mediaeval religious controversy in England and brings to life the half forgotten figures of Uhtred de Boldon, Benedictine monk, and William Jordan, preaching friar. Each in his day was a personage and deserves to be remembered among the theologians who illuminated the fourteenth century.

More is known of Uhtred than of William. Called 'perhaps the greatest and most interesting of Durham monk-scholars,' Uhtred was, successively, Oxford scholar; Warden of Durham College, Oxford; Prior of Finchale, a cell of Durham; ambassador of Edward III to Pope Urban V at Avignon; and Sub-prior of Durham. He died January 28, 1396.

Of the events in William Jordan's life little is known. He was long connected with the Papal Court, and in 1358 became Prior of the House of Friar Preachers at York. His great activity was in religious controversy that brought him in conflict, among others, with Wycliffe and Uhtred. The question at issue between them was the familiar one of the relative value of grace and works as means of salvation. Jordan, who appears to have had Pelagian leanings, charged the orthodox Uhtred with heresy, because Uhtred set grace above works. To this charge Uhtred replied in a tract 'Contra Querelas Fratrum,' here printed in full from MS. Royal 6 D x. It is described in part as follows (pp. 38, 39):

The tract *Contra querelas fratrum* is interesting, quite apart from its biographical and controversial importance, because it deals with some of the most discussed theological questions of its day. Probably the most important of these is the necessity for divine grace. Uhtred discusses the subject in articles fourteen to twenty. Briefly, his doctrine is that no grace can be equal in value to that which is given unmerited, that grace without which the pilgrim cannot obtain heaven. This grace is higher in nature than any obtained by works, and is necessary for the performance of any act of merit. This grace is required as much for the state of innocence as for the state of sin. These ideas seem to be strictly orthodox, and it is



difficult to understand why Uhtred should have been attacked for them. But they were contrary to the ideas widely held by the followers of the Pelagian heresy. It is obvious that Jordan must have been an upholder of at least part of this heresy, since his ideas did not agree with those of Uhtred.

The ideas held by Uhtred did agree with those held by Wycliffe, the author of the *Pearl*, and the author of *Piers Plowman* (p. 48). That the author of *Piers Plowman* held Pelagianism and its advocate William Jordan in supreme contempt may be accepted as a fact, if Miss Marcett is correct when she suggests that Jordan was the original of the Doctor or 'maister' who dines at the house of Conscience (*Piers Plowman*, B-text, Passus XIII, lines 21-221). The identification of Langland's remarkably realistic figure with the Dominican Jordan turns in the main upon a proper understanding of lines 83, 84:

'I shal Iangle to this Jurdan· with his Iust wombe,  
To telle me what penaunce is· of which he preched rather.'

To Skeat a modern rendering of these lines would begin:

'I shall argue with this chamber-pot . . . (*Piers Plowman*, II, 192),  
but Miss Marcett would begin them:

'I shall argue with this William Jordan. . . .

On the ground of good sense the second rendering is better if evidence for such a rendering is forthcoming. Such evidence is found in the poet's undoubted intention of making the Doctor himself a Dominican (Passus XIII, 70, 73-4, 93-4), and his attribution to him of certain personal traits, such as pomposity and fondness for argument and casuistical subtleties, that characterized William Jordan himself.

To the student of mediaeval literature and history the restoration to their proper places of Uhtred and of William will be welcome, but more important is the identification with a real person of another of Langland's brilliant portraits. The whole business of hunting up 'originals,' whether for the characters of Chaucer's Prologue or for the allegorical figures in *Piers Plowman*, is hazardous at best. Credit belongs to this attempt for its thoroughness and for the modesty with which the results are presented. We agree with the author that she has made an 'extremely plausible conjecture.'

COOLIDGE OTIS CHAPMAN

*College of Puget Sound*

*The History of the English Novel*, Vol. IX, *The Day Before Yesterday*. By ERNEST A. BAKER. London: H. F. and G. Witherby, 1938. Pp. 364. 16 Sh.

It is a pleasure to find that so much critical discrimination and flexibility of mind can go with so much learning as in this penultimate volume of Baker's history of the novel. One might anticipate that an author who had done ample justice to the Elizabethans, to Richardson and Sterne, to Scott and Dickens and Trollope—not to speak of the countless minor figures through more than four centuries—would tire at length and rest content in the formulas so far developed by English genius. Not so with this historian. The prodigious task already accomplished of reading, relishing and interpreting has left him with as fresh a mind as ever—as open to new impressions and eager to trace the extensions of imaginative sensibility into regions uncharted by our classic novelists. He does not even stop with the less extreme departures of the writers studied. He has as warm appreciation of *Jude the Obscure* as of *The Return of the Native*. He is more enthusiastic over *The Golden Bowl* and *The Brook Kerith* than over *The American* and *Esther Waters*. And he devotes his subtlest powers of analysis to those developments of feeling and technique which carry the art of fiction farthest beyond the point where it rested in the age of Fielding or the age of Meredith. He has the nicest apprehension of the individual genius which enables each one of the greater writers, and of some less great, to fashion and color a world of his own as distinct and plausible as any of the worlds in which men actually find themselves living. And he is particularly apt at tracing the degrees of power possessed by different novelists to captivate and convince. One of the most remarkable of his studies is that of Gissing, whose seriousness and energy and command of his subject-matter present us with the teasing problem of why he should have failed to create a thoroughly satisfying world of seemings. Gissing's want of humor, of the zest of life, of sympathy for his "nether world"; his abstract conception of character; his bookish dialogue; his old-fashioned technique of plotting and specification—these are some of the points adduced by Mr. Baker to account for his failure. There is not space to discuss our critic's occasional lapses from complete adequacy—his neglect to define "realism" in connection with the early work of Moore, his rather conventional references to Zola, his assumption that Hardy's "determinism" in *The Dynasts* can or should affect our sense of tragedy in his novels. It is much more important to attest the almost infallible justice of his appraisals and of his assignment of esthetic reasons for them.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

*The University of Minnesota*

BRIEF MENTION

---

*Cosimo de' Medici, Pater Patriae, 1389-1464* By CURT S. GUTKIND. Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1938. Pp. 340. This volume makes hard reading but contains useful information and well-considered judgments. Like the numerous appendices, the introductory survey of the Florentine commonwealth resembles rather a collection of notes than an integrated exposition, and even the narrative of Florentine politics on the eve of Medician dominance lacks perspective. Only in the sections where the author has been able to make Cosimo dominate his background does the story come to life. The *Pater Patriae* is presented with understanding sympathy and frankly expressed admiration but without adulation and with only very light touches of "whitewash." How Cosimo acquired his international reputation, how he used his international connections to strengthen his position at home, and how he maintained himself not only by manipulating the political machinery of Florence but also by conciliating the prejudices and ambitions of the Florentines—these questions are fully and ably dealt with. The connections between Cosimo's business transactions and his political activity is a more difficult problem which the author fails to solve in spite of an elaborate survey of the business net work of the Medici. "Cosimo was above all a merchant and a banker" (p. 108). We would therefore like to see his mind at work on a business problem, as we do see it at work on the problems of diplomacy and of domestic politics. Yet, in view of the nature of the sources, it may be unfair to criticize the failure to resurrect this part of Cosimo's thinking. Certainly Mr. Gutkind has tried and has canvassed a very wide range of writings for aid. In the printing, however, of the very useful bibliography there are a number of curious slips: for example, Fanfoni for Fanfani (p. 322), Sayons for Sayous (p. 331), and Randolph, G. for Richards, G. R. B. (p. 329).

FREDERIC C. LANE

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Sara Coleridge and Henry Reed.* Edited by LESLIE NATHAN BROUGHTON. (Cornell Studies in English, vol. xxvii.) Ithaca, N. Y.: University Press. Pp. xviii + 117. \$1.50. This small volume is devoted primarily to Sara, the daughter of S. T. Coleridge, the wife of H. N. Coleridge, and the mother of Herbert Coleridge of the *New English Dictionary*. It includes a useful brief memoir of Sara by Henry Reed, professor of rhetoric and English literature at the

University of Pennsylvania; six long letters of Sara written to Reed, two unpublished as a whole and the others unpublished in part; some interesting comments by Sara on Reed's *Memoir of Gray*, again partly unpublished; and finally a few rather disappointing marginalia by Sara on Christopher Wordsworth's *Memoirs of William Wordsworth*, interesting chiefly when Sara speaks of the Wordsworth children. The letters are the heart of the book, especially the sixteen-page fifth letter, with its disparaging comment on Christopher Wordsworth. But everything in this volume adds to our knowledge of Sara's noble character and high intelligence.

THOMAS M. RAYSOR

*The University of Nebraska*

---

*Bibliography of Courtesy and Conduct Books in Seventeenth-century England.* By GERTRUDE E. NOYES, New Haven: [Printed for the author by Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor] 1937. Pp. iv + 111. Miss Noyes's work does not aim at being an all-inclusive, "definitive" bibliography—a type possible only after many scholars have labored in a field,—nor does it confine itself to being merely "selective." Rather, it is what may be termed an "exploratory" bibliography, which in scope goes far beyond the "selective" type, making accessible the titles of a very considerable number of books discovered in a fruitfully intensive search. As such, the bibliography is a highly creditable piece of work. Although admittedly not exhaustive (it is perhaps unfortunate that the author excluded additional items available from John E. Mason's *Gentlefolk in the Making* (1935), on the ground that her work had already taken shape when Mr. Mason's book appeared), the bibliography does, as the author hopes it will, "convey some suggestion of the great mass of courtesy and conduct literature which flooded England in the seventeenth century." She has listed most of the important works in the field, and has included, besides, a great number of out-of-the-way and curious works which scholars will be glad to know about. A classified index has been added, which enables one to see at a glance how important, in bulk, are certain types—translations, "characters," dialogues, satires, etc.—and what books discuss various topics, e. g. education, politics, "honor," travel, etc. Much effort has gone into listing as many editions as possible of works published throughout the century.

W. LEE USTICK

*Cambridge, Massachusetts*







# THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

---

**Astronomical Thought in Renaissance England. A Study of the English Scientific Writings from 1500 to 1645.** By FRANCIS R. JOHNSON. 373 pages. \$3.25.

The purpose of this volume is to survey the English writings on science from about 1500 to the mid-seventeenth century, in order to chart the course of astronomical thought in scientific circles during that significant period of transition from the old cosmology to the new.

**A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed Before 1700.** By FRANCIS R. JOHNSON. 75 pages, 11 reproductions of early title pages, 4to. \$2.75.

In the preparation of this bibliography the author examined personally over half the copies of the rarer editions of Spenser now in American libraries, including the libraries of private collectors. In addition, the copies in all other public libraries, both in America and Great Britain, having important Spenser collections, were checked by correspondents.

**The Classic Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mythological Symbolism.** By CHARLES W. LEMMI. 236 pages. \$2.50.

This volume assembles and discusses the great essayist's allusions to the gods. It may be said that Professor Lemmi studies Bacon not only as a mythographer but also as a philosopher and a man.

**Milton's Debt to Greek Tragedy in 'Samson Agonistes.'** By WILLIAM R. PARKER. 276 pages. \$2.50.

This is a book which should be useful to students of Greek tragedy and comparative literature, as well as to readers of English poetry. Its purpose is to establish the major aspects of Milton's debt to Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides in his effort to re-create Attic drama in English.

**Spenser's Theory of Friendship.** By CHARLES G. SMITH. 82 pages. \$1.25.

This volume comprises a series of researches which endeavor to throw some new light on Spenser's virtue of friendship in the *Faerie Queene*. The points of view reached are corroborated by material widespread in Spenser's literary environment.

**The Axiochus of Plato translated by Edmund Spenser.** Edited by FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD. 90 pages. \$2.75.

Professor Padelford's unique copy of this "lost" dialogue has been photographically reproduced and is fully edited with an introduction and notes.

**The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition.** Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, CHARLES G. OSGOOD, FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD and RAY HEFFNER. 6 volumes. \$36.00.

This edition aims to furnish an accurate text of Spenser's poetry and prose and to make accessible in convenient form the fruits of all the significant scholarship and literary criticism which have contributed to the better understanding and appreciation of this major poet.

---

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE



# Zipfel's BAKTERIEN UND ANSTECKENDE KRANKHEITEN

*In the Heath Visible Vocabulary German Series*

*Edited by* ERWIN T. MOHME  
*University of Southern California*

On the intermediate level—the second of a series of inexpensive booklets with interleaved visible vocabulary for students of scientific German. (The first one, Horn's *Der menschliche Körper*, is on the elementary level.) The student has constantly before him, as he reads, all the helps necessary to the interpretation of a given page. *In press.*

---

---

## D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON      NEW YORK      CHICAGO      ATLANTA  
SAN FRANCISCO      DALLAS      LONDON

## JUST PUBLISHED . . . . . EINFÜHRUNG INS DEUTSCHE

PAUL R. POPE

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

● This text, written expressly for the needs of the college student employs a purely inductive approach, features modern and interesting reading material and is thoroughly practical and teachable.

## FORTHCOMING . . . . . SCHREIBEN SIE DEUTSCH!

An unusually thorough and interesting composition text by Oscar C. Burkhard and L. G. Downs, University of Minnesota. To be published in August, 1939.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY 257 FOURTH AVE. NEW YORK